arXiv:0812.4822v1 [math.MG] 28 Dec 2008

Geometry of Non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff distance

Derong Qiu *
(Department of Mathematics, Capital Normal University,
Beijing 100037, P.R.China)

1. Introduction and statement of main results

In this paper, we study the geometry of non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff metric. This is the first part of our series work, which we try to establish some facts about the counterpart of Gromov-Hausdorff metric in the non-Archimedean spaces. One of the motivation of this work is to find some implied relations between this geometry and number theory via p-adic analysis, so that we can use the former as a tool to study the relating arithmetic aspects.

Now we state the main results in the present work. Firstly, in order to establish a compatible theory for the counterpart of Gromov-Hausdorff metric in the non-Archimedean spaces, like the well known case for general metric spaces (see [G] and [BBI]), we construct three corresponding key tools *strong correspondence* (see Def.2.11), *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry (see Def.2.22) and *strong* $\varepsilon-approximations$ (see Def.3.4) for the non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff distance $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ (see Def.2.1). Then we obtain the following Theorems and formulae (see also the related Cor.2.24

---

* E-mail: derong@mail.cnu.edu.cn

and 3.7) for explicitly computing $\widehat{d}_{GH}$.

Theorem A (see Theorem 2.14 below). For any two non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$,

$$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) = \inf_{\widehat{C}}(\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}),$$

where the inf is taken over all *strong correspondences* $\widehat{C}$ between X and Y.

Theorem B (see Theorem 2.23 below). Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then

(1) If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) < \varepsilon$, then there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y.

(2) If there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) \leq \varepsilon$.

Theorem C (see Theorem 3.5 below). Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two compact non-Archimedean metric spaces.

(1) If X and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon-$*approximations* of each other, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) \leq \varepsilon$.

(2) If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) < \varepsilon$, then X and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon -$ *approximations* of each other.

Next we establish several convergence theorems for the non-Archimedean metric spaces under $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ (see Theorems 3.8 , 3.9 and 3.12 below), one of them is the following Compactness Theorem about the *strongly uniformly totally bounded* class (see Def.3.11 for its definition) of compact non-Archimedean metric spaces.

Theorem D (Compactness Theorem) (see Theorem 3.12 below).

Any *strongly uniformly totally bounded* class $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{sut}$ of compact non-Archimedean metric spaces is pre-compact in the strong Gromov-Hausdorff topology. That is, any sequence of elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{sut}$ contains a Cauchy subsequence under the metric $\widehat{d}_{GH}$.

Using the above three tools, especially the *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry and its related results, we obtain the following theorem, which enables us conveniently calculate the non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff distance between non-Archimedean metric spaces. As an application, we use it working out such results about local fields (see Example 4.7 below)

Theorem E (see Theorem 4.2 below). Let $(X,\ \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y,\ \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces and denote $D = \max\{\mathrm{diam}(X),\ \mathrm{diam}(Y)\}$. Then

(1) $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) \geq \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 :\ W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} = W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}\}$.

(2) If there does not exist $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} = W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}$, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) = \infty$.

(3A) If $D < +\infty$, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) \leq D$.

(3B) If $D < +\infty$ and $\mathrm{diam}(X) \neq \mathrm{diam}(Y)$, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) = D$.

By Theorem E, we obtain the following theorem about converging sequence.

Theorem F (see Theorem 4.4 and Remark 4.5 below). Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of non-Archimedean metric spaces with $\mathrm{diam}(X_n) < +\infty$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and X be a non-Archimedean metric space with $\mathrm{diam}(X) < +\infty$. If $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$, then

(1) If $\mathrm{diam}(X) = 0$, then $\mathrm{diam}(X_n) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.

(2) If $\mathrm{diam}(X) > 0$, then there exists a $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n >$

n_0, $\operatorname{diam}(X_n) = \operatorname{diam}(X)$.

Since we already have two kinds of metric structures $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ and d_{GH} for non-Archimedean metric spaces, to compare them, we define their ratio as the metric ratio function Υ_m (see Def.2.16 below) and then by using the explicit formula of Theorem E we prove that Υ_m is unbounded, which is stated in the following theorem. This Theorem is key to our construction, e.g., from it we know that the strong convergence $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$ and the convergence $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}} X$ (see Def.3.1 below for $\longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S}$ and [BBI] for $\longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}}$) are not equivalent, so the two kinds of metric structures $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ and d_{GH} are different in essential.

Theorem G (see Theorem 4.8 below). The metric ratio function Υ_m is unbounded, in other words, for any $c \geq 2$, there exist non-Archimedean metric spaces X and Y such that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \geq c \cdot d_{GH}(X, Y)$.

In fact, in the proof of Theorem G, we obtain that

$$\Upsilon_m(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^{\Delta}) = 2q + 2 \longrightarrow \infty \text{ as } q \longrightarrow \infty$$

and $d_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^{\Delta}) = \frac{1}{2q}$ (see the proof of Theorem 4.8 and Remark 4.9 below).

Moreover, some questions about the relations between $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ and d_{GH} and computation of $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ are suggested (see Questions 2.18 and 4.3). A equilibrium function (see Def.2.19 and Lemma 2.20) is defined associating to each *stong correspondence* $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ between non-Archimedean metric spaces, and a question about this function is also suggested (see Question 2.21).

Based on these results, we will discuss the related arithmetic applications as well as geometric structures on $p-$adic manifolds in separate papers [Q1] and [Q2].

Notation and terminology. As usual, the symbols $\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{F}_p, \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $\mathbb{Q}_p$ represent the integers, rational numbers, real numbers, complex numbers, field with p elements, $p-$adic integers and $p-$adic numbers, respectively. We denote the completion of the algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ by $\mathbb{C}_p$, which is endowed the normalized valuation $|.|_p$ satisfying $|p|_p = \frac{1}{p}$, and called the Tate field (see [K], [Se]).

Let X be a metric space endowed with the metric d. For any subsets A and B of X, the diameter of A is $\operatorname{diam}(A) = \sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in A\}$, A is bounded if $\operatorname{diam}(A) < \infty$. The distance between A and B is $\operatorname{dist}(A, B) = \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in A, y \in B\}$, in particular, for $x \in X$, $\operatorname{dist}(x, A) = \operatorname{dist}(\{x\}, A)$. For a set $Y \subset X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, its $\varepsilon-$neighborhood is the set $U_\varepsilon(Y) = \{x \in X : \operatorname{dist}(x, Y) < \varepsilon\}$. Y is an $\varepsilon-$net in X if $\operatorname{dist}(x, Y) < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in X$. Particularly, X is called totally bounded if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a finite $\varepsilon-$net in it. The Hausdorff distance between A and B, denoted by $d_H(A, B)$, is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} d_H(A, B) &= \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 : A \subset U_\varepsilon(B) \ \text{ and } \ B \subset U_\varepsilon(A)\} \\ &= \max\{\sup_{a \in A} \operatorname{dist}(a, B), \quad \sup_{b \in B} \operatorname{dist}(b, A)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given two metric spaces (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y), the Gromov-Hausdorff distance between them is defined as

$$d_{GH}(X, Y) = \inf\{d_{Z,H}(f(X), g(Y))\},$$

where the inf is taken over all metric spaces (Z, d_Z) and over all isometric embeddings $f : X \hookrightarrow Z$ and $g : Y \hookrightarrow Z$. $d_{Z,H}$ denotes the Hausdorff distance between subsets of Z (see [BBI] and [G]).

Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specified, we use the notation $\widehat{d}$ denote the non-Archimedean metric on a space X, that is, $\widehat{d}$ is a metric on X and satisfies the strong triangle inequality

$$\widehat{d}(x,z) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}(x,y),\ \widehat{d}(y,z)\}\ (x,y,z \in X).$$

A set X endowed with a non-Archimedean metric $\widehat{d}_X$ is called a non-Archimedean metric space (also called ultrametric space), which is denoted by $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$. For the basic properties of non-Archimedean metric spaces, we refer to [BGR] and [Sc].

Acknowledgements. This work began on the summer of the year 2007, when Professor Xiaochun Rong (Rutgers Univ. USA) visited our mathematics department. I thank him heartily for helpful discussing on metric geometry, especially for letting me know the Gromov geometry as well as the two books [G] and [BBI], from which I benefit very much. At that time, I started to be interested in the question on how to establish the counterpart of Gromov-Hausdorff metric in the non-Archimedean spaces, so that we can use it as a tool to study arithmetic aspects in number theory, particularly in elliptic curve (see [Q1] for our work on the part of arithmetic applications), which is one of my main interesting research fields. I thank heartily Prof. Xianke Zhang (Tsinghua Univ.), my PhD Advisor, for introducing me in the field of algebraic number theory, and for his great help and encouragement. I thank heartily Prof. Qingzhong Li, Prof. Kezheng Li and Prof. Ke Wu (Capital Normal Univ., Beijing) for their warm-hearted help and regard. I thank heartily Prof. Shouwu Zhang (Columbia Univ. of New York) and Prof. Keqin Feng (Tsinghua Univ.) for their generous help and support in my studying arithmetic geometry at Columbia Univ. of New York (2004-2005) and ICTP, Italy (2002).

2. Non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff distance

Let $(X_i, \widehat{d_i})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces. As in the general case of metric spaces, it is not difficult to show that there exist a non-Archimedean metric space $(X, \widehat{d_X})$ such that both X_1 and X_2 can be isometrically embedded into X.

Definition 2.1. Let $(X_i, \widehat{d_i})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces. The non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff distance between them, denoted by $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2)$, is defined by

$$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) = \inf\{\widehat{d}_H(f_1(X_1), f_2(X_2))\},$$

where the inf is taken over all non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X, \widehat{d})$ and over all isometric embeddings $f_1 : X_1 \hookrightarrow X$ and $f_2 : X_2 \hookrightarrow X$. $\widehat{d}_H$ denotes the Hausdorff distance between subsets of X.

By definition, obviously we always have $d_{GH}(X_1, X_2) \leq \widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2)$ for all non-Archimedean metric spaces X_1 and X_2.

Example 2.2. Let $(X, \widehat{d})$ be a non-Archimedean metric space, $Y \subset X$ be an $\varepsilon-$net with $\varepsilon > 0$. Then easily we have $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \leq \varepsilon$.

Definition 2.3. Let $(X_i, \widehat{d_i})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces. Denote $X = X_1 \sqcup X_2$ be the disjoint union. A non-Archimedean metric $\widehat{d}$ on X is called admissible if it extends the metrics on X_1 and X_2, i.e., $\widehat{d}\mid_{X_i} = \widehat{d_i}$ $(i = 1, 2)$. More generally, for a family of non-Archimedean metric spaces $\{(X_i, \widehat{d_i})\}_{i\in\Lambda}$, let $X = \sqcup_{i\in\Lambda} X_i$ be the disjoint union of all X_i. A non-Archimedean metric $\widehat{d}$ on X is called admissible if it extends the metrics on all X_i, i.e., $\widehat{d}\,|_{X_i}= \widehat{d_i}$ for every $i \in \Lambda$. Then as in the usual case [G], we define

Definition 2.4. Let $(X_i, \widehat{d_i})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces. Define

$$\overline{\widehat{d}}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) = \inf\{\widehat{d}_H(X_1, X_2)\},$$

where the inf is taken over all admissible non-Archimedean metrics $\widehat{d}$ on $X_1 \sqcup X_2$.

Proposition 2.5. Let $(X_i, \widehat{d_i})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces. Then

$$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) = \overline{\widehat{d}}_{GH}(X_1, X_2).$$

Proof. It is obvious that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) \leq \overline{\widehat{d}}_{GH}(X_1, X_2)$. So we only need to prove the converse. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a non-Archimedean metric space $(X, \widehat{d})$ and isometric embeddings $f_i : X_i \longrightarrow X$ $(i = 1, 2)$ such that $\widehat{d}_H(f_1(X_1), f_2(X_2)) < \widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) + \varepsilon$. Denote $X' = X_1 \sqcup X_2$ (disjoint union), we define a function $\widehat{d_3}$ on $X' \times X'$ as follows: For any $x_1, x_2 \in X'$,

$$\widehat{d_3}(x_1, x_2) = \widehat{d_3}(x_2, x_1) = \begin{cases} \widehat{d}(f_i(x_1), f_i(x_2)) & \text{if } x_1, x_2 \in X_i \ (i = 1, 2); \\ \max\{\widehat{d}(f_1(x_1), f_2(x_2)),\ \varepsilon\} & \text{if } x_1 \in X_1, x_2 \in X_2. \end{cases}$$

Then by a direct calculation, it is not difficult to show that $\widehat{d_3}$ is an admissible non-Archimedean metric on X'. Therefore the Hausdorff distance between X_1 and

X_2 in X' is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{d}_{3H}(X_1, X_2) = \max\{\sup_{x_1 \in X_1} \operatorname{dist}(x_1, X_2), \quad \sup_{x_2 \in X_2} \operatorname{dist}(x_2, X_1)\} \\
&\le \max\{\sup_{x_1 \in X_1} \max\{\operatorname{dist}(f_1(x_1), f_2(X_2)),\ \varepsilon\},\ \sup_{x_2 \in X_2} \max\{\operatorname{dist}(f_2(x_2), f_1(X_1)),\ \varepsilon\}\} \\
&= \max\{\sup_{x_1 \in X_1} \operatorname{dist}(f_1(x_1), f_2(X_2)), \quad \sup_{x_2 \in X_2} \operatorname{dist}(f_2(x_2), f_1(X_1)), \quad \varepsilon\} \\
&= \max\{\widehat{d}_H(f_1(X_1),\ f_2(X_2)), \quad \varepsilon\} \le \max\{\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) + \varepsilon,\ \varepsilon\} \\
&= \widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by definition, $\overline{\widehat{d}}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) \le \widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) + \varepsilon$, so $\overline{\widehat{d}}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) \le \widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2)$ because $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary. The proof is completed. □

Proposition 2.6 [Zarichnyi]. The function $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ is a non-Archimedean metric on the set of isometry classes of non-Archimedean metric spaces.

Proof. This can be verified directly via a tedious calculation as I have done myself. After finishing this paper, I read a paper [Z] of I. Zarichnyi, in which he has already proven this proposition (see Theorem 1.2 of [Z]) as well as defined the function $\widehat{d}_{GH}$, which he called the Gromov-Hausdorff ultrametric. So this proposition owes completely to Zarichnyi, and we refer to his paper [Z] for the detailed proof. □

For any non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X_i, \widehat{d}_i)$ $(i = 1, 2)$, they have now been defined two kinds of distances $d_{GH}(X_1, X_2)$ and $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2)$, the former is their Gromov-Hausdorff distance, and the later is their non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff distance. We will study the relations between them (see Theorem 2.8, Corollary 2.9 and Theorem 4.8 below). In the following, we denote by $\widehat{\Gamma}_c$ the set of isometry classes of all compact non-Archimedean metric spaces, and call $(\widehat{\Gamma}_c,\ \widehat{d}_{GH})$

(i.e., endowed with the metric $\widehat{d}_{GH}$) the non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff space. It is easy to see that $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ is a finite metric on this space. In fact, $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_1, X_2) < \infty$ for any bounded non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X_i, \widehat{d}_i)(i = 1, 2)$. Zarichnyi has proved that $(\widehat{\Gamma}_c, \widehat{d}_{GH})$ is complete but not separable (see [Z, Prop. 2.1 and 2.2]).

Example 2.7. Let $(X, \widehat{d})$ be a non-Archimedean metric space, P be a non-Archimedean metric space consisting of one point. Then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, P) = \text{diam } X$, in particular, $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, P) = 2d_{GH}(X, P)$.

Proof. The first equality can be easily verified by Def.2.4 and Prop.2.5. The second equality follows from the fact that $d_{GH}(X, P) = \frac{1}{2}$ diam X (see [BBI, P.255]). $\square$

Next we come to establish some formulae for explicitly computing the non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff distance. The first one is via the key tool *strong correspondence* which we will define in the following (see Def.2.11 below). Before doing this, we first prove an inequality (see Theorem 2.8) which giving a lower bound for $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ by using the tool *correspondence* in the usual sense. For two sets X and Y, recall that [BBI, p.256, 257] a *correrepondence* between them is a set $C \subset X \times Y$ satisfying the following condition: for every $x \in X$ there exists at least one $y \in Y$ such that $(x, y) \in C$, and similarly for every $y \in Y$ there exists an $x \in X$ such that $(x, y) \in C$. For example, if $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is a surjective map, then $C_f = \{(x, f(x)) : x \in X\}$ is a *correspondence* between X and Y, which is called the *correspondence* associated with f (see [BBI, p.256]). Now let C be a *correpondence* between metric spaces (X, d_X) and (Y, d_Y), then the *distorsion* of C is defined by

$$\mathrm{dis}C = \sup\{\mid d_X(x,x') - d_Y(y,y') \mid : \ (x,y),(x',y') \in \ C\}.$$

Moreover, if $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is an arbitrary map, the *distorsion* of f is defined by

$$\mathrm{dis}f = \sup_{x_1,x_2 \in X} \mid d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2) - d_X(x_1,x_2) \mid .$$

It is easy to see that $\mathrm{dis}C_f = \mathrm{dis}f$ if f is a surjective map (See [BBI, p.257 and p.249] for the properties of *distorsions*).

Theorem 2.8. For any two non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$,

$$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) \geq \inf_C(\mathrm{dis}C),$$

where the inf is taken over all *correspondences* C between X and Y.

Proof. For any $r > \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y)$, by definition, there exists a non-Archimedean metric spaces $(Z, \widehat{d}_Z)$ such that X and Y can be isometrically embedded in it and $\widehat{d}_{Z,H}(X,Y) < r$. We may view X and Y as subspaces of Z with $\widehat{d}_Z \mid_X = \widehat{d}_X$ and $\widehat{d}_Z \mid_Y = \widehat{d}_Y$. Let $C_0 = \{(x,y) : x \in X, \ y \in Y, \ \widehat{d}_Z(x,y) < r\}$. By $\widehat{d}_{Z,H}(X,Y) < r$ we have $X \subset U_r(Y)$ and $Y \subset U_r(X)$. So for any $x \in X$, there exists a $y \in Y$ such that $\widehat{d}_Z(x,y) < r$, hence $(x,y) \in C_0$. Similarly, for any $y \in Y$, there exists an $x \in X$ such that $(x,y) \in C_0$. This shows that C_0 is a *correspondence* between X and Y. Now let $(x,y),(x',y') \in C_0$, then $\widehat{d}_Z(x,y) < r$ and $\widehat{d}_Z(x',y') < r$. So $\widehat{d}_X(x,x') \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Z(x,y), \ \widehat{d}_Z(x',y)\} \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Z(x,y), \ \widehat{d}_Z(x',y'), \ \widehat{d}_Z(y',y)\} \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Z(x,y), \ \widehat{d}_Z(x',y')\} + \widehat{d}_Y(y',y)$, so $\widehat{d}_X(x,x') - \widehat{d}_Y(y,y')$
$\leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Z(x,y), \ \widehat{d}_Z(x',y')\} < r$. Similarly, we have $\widehat{d}_Y(y,y') - \widehat{d}_X(x,x') < r$. So

$| \widehat{d}_X(x,x') - \widehat{d}_Y(y,y') | < r$. Therefore by definition, $\mathrm{dis}\,C_0 = \sup\{| \widehat{d}_X(x,x') - \widehat{d}_Y(y,y') | : (x,y), (x',y') \in C_0\} \le r$. So $r \ge \inf_C(\mathrm{dis}\,C)$. Since $r > \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y)$ is arbitrary, we obtain $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) \ge \inf_C(\mathrm{dis}\,C)$. This proves Theorem 2.8. $\square$

It is well known that $d_{GH}(X,Y) = \frac{1}{2}\inf_C(\mathrm{dis}\,C)$ (see [BBI, Thm.7.3.25]). So we have

Corollary 2.9. For any two non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$,

$$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) \ge 2d_{GH}(X,Y).$$

Note that Example 2.7 shows that the equality can hold in some cases.

Let X and Y be metric spaces and $\varepsilon > 0$. Recall that a (possibly noncontinuous !) map $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ is called an $\varepsilon-$isometry if $\mathrm{dis}f < \varepsilon$ and $f(X)$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in Y (see [BBI, p.258]. Note that we use $<$ instead of $\le$ in this definition).

Corollary 2.10. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces and $\varepsilon > 0$. If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) < \varepsilon$, then there exists an $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y.

Proof. If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) < \varepsilon$, then by Corollary 2.9, we have $d_{GH}(X,Y) < \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon$, so by [BBI, Cor.7.3.28], there exists an $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y. $\square$

Definition 2.11. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces, C be a *correspondence* between X and Y. If C satisfies the following condition

(C_{NA}) For any $(x,y) \in X \times Y \setminus C$, there exist $x' \in X$ and $y' \in Y$ such that

$$(x,y'),\ (x',y) \in C, \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{d}_X(x,x') = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y') > \mathrm{dis}\,C.$$

Then we call C a *strong correspondence* between X and Y.

Lemma 2.12. The condition (C_{NA}) in Definition 2.11 is equivalent to the following condition

(C'_{NA}) If $(x,y) \in X \times Y \setminus C$, then for any $x' \in X$ and $y' \in Y$ satisfying $(x,y'),\ (x',y) \in C,$ we have $\widehat{d}_X(x,x') = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y') > \mathrm{dis}\, C.$

Proof. (C_{NA}) $\Longrightarrow$ (C'_{NA}) : If $(x,y) \in X \times Y \setminus C$, then there exist $x_0 \in X$ and $y_0 \in Y$ such that $(x,y_0),\ (x_0,y) \in C,$ and $\widehat{d}_X(x,x_0) = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y_0) > \mathrm{dis}\, C$. Now for any $x' \in X$ and $y' \in Y$ satisfying $(x,y'),\ (x',y) \in C,$ we have $\widehat{d}_Y(y_0,y') = \mid \widehat{d}_Y(y_0,y') - \widehat{d}_X(x,x) \mid \leq \mathrm{dis}\, C$. So by the strong triangle inequality, $\widehat{d}_Y(y,y') = \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(y,y_0),\ \widehat{d}_Y(y_0,y')\} = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y_0) > \mathrm{dis}\, C$. Similarly, $\widehat{d}_X(x,x') = \widehat{d}_X(x,x_0) > \mathrm{dis}\, C$. Hence $\widehat{d}_X(x,x') = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y') > \mathrm{dis}\, C$.

(C'_{NA}) $\Longrightarrow$ (C_{NA}) : Obvious. □

Notation. In the following, we use the notation $\widehat{C}$ instead of C to denote a *strong correspondence* between X and Y.

Lemma 2.13. Let $(X,\widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y,\widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces.

(1) There always exist *strong correspondences* between X and Y,

(2) Let $\widehat{C}$ be a *strong correspondence* between X and Y, let $(x,y),(x,y'),(x,y'') \in X \times Y$. If $(x,y'),(x,y'') \in \widehat{C}$ and $(x,y) \notin \widehat{C}$, then $\widehat{d}_Y(y,y') = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y'') > \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}$. Similarly, if $(x',y),(x'',y) \in \widehat{C}$ and $(x,y) \notin \widehat{C}$, then $\widehat{d}_X(x,x') = \widehat{d}_X(x,x'') > \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}$.

Proof. (1) Obvious, e.g. $\widehat{C} = X \times Y$.

(2) Since $(x,y) \in X \times Y \setminus \widehat{C}$, by definition, there exist $x_0 \in X$ and $y_0 \in Y$ such that $(x,y_0),(x_0,y) \in \widehat{C}$ and $\widehat{d}_X(x,x_0) = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y_0) > \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}$. Then $\widehat{d}_Y(y_0,y') =$

$|\ \widehat{d}_Y(y_0,y') - \widehat{d}_X(x,x)\ | \le \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}$. So by the strong triangle inequality, we have $\widehat{d}_Y(y,y') = \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(y,y_0),\ \widehat{d}_Y(y_0,y')\} = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y_0) > \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}$. Also, $\widehat{d}_Y(y',y'') = |\ \widehat{d}_Y(y',y'') - \widehat{d}_X(x,x)\ | \le \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}$. So $\widehat{d}_Y(y,y'') = \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(y,y'),\ \widehat{d}_Y(y',y'')\} = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y') > \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}$. $\square$

Theorem 2.14. For any two non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X,\widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y,\widehat{d}_Y)$,

$$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) = \inf_{\widehat{C}}(\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}),$$

where the inf is taken over all *strong correspondences* $\widehat{C}$ between X and Y.

Proof. Step 1. For any $r > \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y)$, by definition, there exists a non-Archimedean metric space $(Z,\widehat{d}_Z)$ such that X and Y can be isometrically embedded in Z (and then we may view X and Y as subspaces of Z) such that $\widehat{d}_{Z,H}(X,Y) < r$. Define

$$\widehat{C}_0 = \{(x,y)\ :\ x \in X,\ y \in Y,\ \widehat{d}_Z(X,Y) \le r\}.$$

Then as done in the proof of Theorem 2.8, it is easy to verify that $\widehat{C}_0$ is a *correspondence* between X and Y, and $\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0 \le r$. Now let $(x,y) \in X \times Y \setminus \widehat{C}_0$. Then $\widehat{d}_Z(x,y) > r$. Since $\widehat{C}_0$ is a *correspondence*, there exist $x' \in X$, and $y' \in Y$ such that $(x',y),\ (x,y') \in \widehat{C}_0$. So $\widehat{d}_Z(x',y) \le r$ and $\widehat{d}_Z(x,y') \le r$. Then by strong triangle inequality,

$$\widehat{d}_X(x,x') = \widehat{d}_Z(x,x') = \max\{\widehat{d}_Z(x,y),\ \widehat{d}_Z(x',y)\} = \widehat{d}_Z(x,y) > r.$$

$$\widehat{d}_Y(y,y') = \widehat{d}_Z(y,y') = \max\{\widehat{d}_Z(x,y),\ \widehat{d}_Z(x,y')\} = \widehat{d}_Z(x,y) > r.$$

Hence $\widehat{d}_X(x,x') = \widehat{d}_Y(y,y') > r \ge \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0$. This shows that $\widehat{C}_0$ is a *strong correspondence* between X and Y. So $\inf_{\widehat{C}}(\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}) \le \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0 \le r$. Since $r > \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y)$ is arbitrary, we obtain that $\inf_{\widehat{C}}(\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}) \le \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y)$.

Step 2. Let $r > \inf_{\widehat{C}}(\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C})$. Then there exists a *strong correspondence* $\widehat{C}_0$ such that $\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0 < r$. Denote $r_0 = \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0$. Let $Z = X \sqcup Y$ be the disjoint union, and define a function $\widehat{d}_Z$ on $Z \times Z$ as follows: For $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, define

$$\widehat{d}_Z(x,y) = \widehat{d}_Z(y,x) = \begin{cases} r_0 & \text{if } (x,y) \in \widehat{C}_0; \\ \widehat{d}_X(x,x') & \text{if } (x,y) \notin \widehat{C}_0 \text{ and } (x',y) \in \widehat{C}_0 \text{ for some } x' \in X. \end{cases}$$

And $\widehat{d}_Z\mid_{X\times X} = \widehat{d}_X,\ \widehat{d}_Z\mid_{Y\times Y} = \widehat{d}_Y$.

Firstly, $\widehat{d}_Z$ is well defined. In fact, if $(x,y) \notin \widehat{C}_0$ with $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, then for any $x', x'' \in X$ such that $(x',y), (x'',y) \in \widehat{C}_0$, by Lemma 2.13.(2), we have $\widehat{d}_X(x,x') = \widehat{d}_X(x,x'') > r_0$. So $\widehat{d}_Z$ is well defined. Obviously, $\widehat{d}_Z$ is symmetry and $\widehat{d}_Z(z_1,z_2) \geq 0$ if $z_1 \neq z_2$. In particular, $\widehat{d}_Z(x,y) \geq r_0$ for any $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$.

Next by the definition and Lemma 2.13.(2), via a direct but tedious calculation, it can be verified that $\widehat{d}_Z$ satisfies the strong triangle inequality, so $\widehat{d}_Z$ is a non-Archimedean semi-metric on Z (if $r_0 > 0$, then $\widehat{d}_Z$ is a non-Archimedean metric). As in [BBI, p.2], we use $(Z/\widehat{d}_Z, \widehat{d}_Z)$ to represent the metric space (of course, non-Archimedean) associated to $(Z, \widehat{d}_Z)$. Then X and Y can be isometrically embedded in $Z/\widehat{d}_Z$. Now we come to compute $\widehat{d}_{Z,H}(X,Y)$ in $Z/\widehat{d}_Z$. For any $x \in X$, by definition, there exist $y \in Y$ such that $(x,y) \in \widehat{C}_0$, so $\widehat{d}_Z(x,y) = r_0$, and then $\mathrm{dist}(x,Y) \leq \widehat{d}_Z(x,y) = r_0 < r$. Hence $x \in U_r(Y)$ and so $X \subset U_r(Y)$. Similarly, $Y \subset U_r(X)$. Therefore by definition $\widehat{d}_{Z,H}(X,Y) \leq r$, so $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) \leq \widehat{d}_{Z,H}(X,Y) \leq r$. Since $r > \inf_{\widehat{C}}(\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C})$ is arbitrary, we obtain that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) \leq \inf_{\widehat{C}}(\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C})$. Therefore $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) = \inf_{\widehat{C}}(\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C})$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.14. □

Remark 2.15. From the step 2 of the proof of Theorem 2.14 above, we know that $\widehat{d}_Z$ is a non-Archimedean metric on Z if $r_0 = \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0 > 0$; and $\widehat{d}_Z$ is a semi-metric if $r_0 = 0$. The later case is trivial. In fact, if $r_0 = 0$, then it is easy to see that X

and Y are isometric. More precisely, the map $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ which sends $x \in X$ to an element $y \in Y$ with $(x, y) \in \widehat{C}_0$ is an isometry, so $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) = 0$. From this we know that, $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ are isometric if and only if there exists a *strong correspondence* $\widehat{C}$ between them with $\operatorname{dis}\widehat{C} = 0$. $\square$

Definition 2.16. For any two non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ with $d_{GH}(X, Y) > 0$, equivalently, X and Y are not isometric. We define a function

$$\Upsilon_m(X, Y) = \frac{\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y)}{d_{GH}(X, Y)}.$$

And call it the metric ratio function.

Note that by Corollary 2.9, we always have $\Upsilon_m(X, Y) \geq 2$.

We will study the properties of the metric ratio function $\Upsilon_m(X, Y)$ later. At first we ask the following

Question 2.17. Is the metric ratio function Υ_m unbounded ? in other words, for any $c \geq 2$, do there exist non-Archimedean metric spaces X and Y such that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \geq c \cdot d_{GH}(X, Y)$?

We will give an affirmative answer to this question in section 4 (see Theorem 4.8 below).

Recall that $\widehat{\Gamma}_c$ is the set of isometry classes of all compact non-Archimedean metric spaces, and we have two kinds of metrics $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ and d_{GH} on it. So we ask the following

Question 2.18. What about the relations between $(\widehat{\Gamma}_c,\ \widehat{d}_{GH})$ and $(\widehat{\Gamma}_c,\ d_{GH})$?

Definition 2.19. Let $\widehat{C}$ be a *strong correspondence* between two non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$. Denote $\widehat{C}^{\perp} = X \times Y \setminus \widehat{C}$ be the complement of $\widehat{C}$ in $X \times Y$. For $\widehat{C}^{\perp} \neq \emptyset$, we define a function $\chi_{\widehat{C}}$ on it as follows: For $(x, y) \in \widehat{C}^{\perp}$, define $\chi_{\widehat{C}}(x, y) = \widehat{d}_Y(y, y')$ for some $y' \in Y$ such that $(x, y') \in \widehat{C}$. Then by the following Lemma 2.20, we know that $\chi_{\widehat{C}}$ is indeed a function on $\widehat{C}^{\perp}$. We simply write it as χ, and call it the equilibrium function associated to $\widehat{C}$ between X and Y.

Lemma 2.20. (1) $\chi_{\widehat{C}}$ is well defined and so it is indeed a function on $\widehat{C}^{\perp}$.

(2) For $(x, y) \in \widehat{C}^{\perp}$, we have $\chi_{\widehat{C}}(x, y) = \widehat{d}_X(x, x')$ for any $x' \in X$ such that $(x', y) \in \widehat{C}$.

(3) We have the inequality

$$\mathrm{dis}(\widehat{C}) < \chi_{\widehat{C}}(x, y) \leq \min\{\mathrm{diam}(X),\ \mathrm{diam}(Y)\}$$

for any $(x, y) \in \widehat{C}^{\perp}$.

Proof. For any $y'' \in Y$ such that $(x, y'') \in \widehat{C}$, by Lemma 2.13.(2), we have $\widehat{d}_Y(y, y') = \widehat{d}_Y(y, y'') > \mathrm{dis}(\widehat{C})$. So $\chi_{\widehat{C}}(x, y) = \widehat{d}_Y(y, y') = \widehat{d}_Y(y, y'')$ is independent of the choice of y'. Similarly, for any $(x', y),\ (x'', y) \in \widehat{C}$ with $x', x'' \in X$, by Lemma 2.13.(2), $\widehat{d}_X(x, x') = \widehat{d}_X(x, x'') > \mathrm{dis}(\widehat{C})$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.12, we have $\widehat{d}_X(x, x') = \widehat{d}_Y(y, y') > \mathrm{dis}(\widehat{C})$. On the other hand, $\chi_{\widehat{C}}(x, y) = \widehat{d}_Y(y, y') = \widehat{d}_X(x, x') \leq \min\{\mathrm{diam}(X),\ \mathrm{diam}(Y)\}$. This proves Lemma 2.20. $\square$

For this function χ, we ask the following

Question 2.21. (1)

$$\text{How about} \inf_{(x,\ y)\in \widehat{C}^{\perp}} \chi_{\widehat{C}}(x,y) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{(x,\ y)\in \widehat{C}^{\perp}} \chi_{\widehat{C}}(x,y) \quad ?$$

Are the former equal to $\mathrm{dis}(\widehat{C})$ and the later equal to $\min\{\mathrm{diam}(X),\ \mathrm{diam}(Y)\}$?

(2) How do $\chi_{\widehat{C}}$ and the quantities in (1) vary as $\widehat{C}$ runs over all the *strong correspondence* between X and Y ?

(3) If X and Y are endowed with some metric measures μ_X and μ_Y, then is the function $\chi_{\widehat{C}}$ integrable under the product measure ? if so, then what about the possible integral $\int_{\widehat{C}^{\perp}} \chi_{\widehat{C}}(x,y) d\mu_{X\times Y}$?

We will discuss these questions in a separate paper.

Now we come to establish another formula for explicitly computing $\widehat{d}_{GH}$. To begin with, we define a useful tool, the *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry, as follows:

Definition 2.22. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ be an $\varepsilon-$isometry. If f satisfies the following conditions:

(SI_1) For $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, if $\widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)) \geq \varepsilon$, then there exists an $x' \in X$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x')) < \varepsilon$ and $\widehat{d}_X(x, x') = \widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x))$.

(SI_2) For $x_1,\ x_2 \in X$, if $\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) \neq \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2))$, then $\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) < \varepsilon$ (equivalently, if $\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) \geq \varepsilon$, then $\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) = \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2))$).

Then we call f a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y.

Theorem 2.23. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then

(1) If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) < \varepsilon$, then there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y.

(2) If there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) \leq \varepsilon$.

Proof. (1) If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,Y) < \varepsilon$, then by Theorem 2.14, $\inf_{\widehat{C}}(\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}\ ) < \varepsilon$. So there exists a *strong correspondence* $\widehat{C}_0$ between X and Y such that $\mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0 < \varepsilon$. We define a map $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ as follows: for each $x \in X$, we select only one $y \in Y$ satisfying $(x,y) \in \widehat{C}_0$, and then define $f(x) = y$ (such y exists because $\widehat{C}_0$ is a *correspondence*). Certainly, such f may not be unique, we fix one among them. By definition, $(x, f(x)) \in \widehat{C}_0$ for all $x \in X$.

Step 1. By definition

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{dis}f &= \sup_{x_1,\ x_2 \in X} \mid \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) - \widehat{d}_X(x_1,x_2) \mid \\ &\leq \sup\{\mid \widehat{d}_Y(y_1,y_2) - \widehat{d}_X(x_1,x_2) \mid :\ (x_1,y_1),\ (x_2,y_2) \in \widehat{C}_0\} \\ &= \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0 < \varepsilon. \qquad \text{That is, } \mathrm{dis}f < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. For any $y \in Y$, there exists $x \in X$ such that $(x,y) \in \widehat{C}_0$. Because $(x, f(x)) \in \widehat{C}_0$, we have

$$\widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)) = \mid \widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)) - \widehat{d}_X(x,x) \mid \leq \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0 < \varepsilon.$$

So $\mathrm{dist}(y, f(X)) \leq \widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)) < \varepsilon$. Since y is arbitrary, this shows that $f(X)$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in Y.

The above two steps show that f is an $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y.

Step 3. Let $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. If $\widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)) \geq \varepsilon$, then $(x,y) \notin \widehat{C}_0$. Otherwise, the fact that both $(x, f(x)) \in \widehat{C}_0$ and $(x,y) \in \widehat{C}_0$ imply

$$\widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)) = \mid \widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)) - \widehat{d}_X(x,x) \mid \leq \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0 < \varepsilon.$$

A contradiction! So $(x,y)\notin \widehat{C}_0$. Then by Lemma 2.12, for any $x'\in X$ satisfying $(x',y)\in \widehat{C}_0$, we have $\widehat{d}_X(x,x')=\widehat{d}_Y(y,f(x))$. Since $(x',f(x'))\in \widehat{C}_0$, we have

$$\widehat{d}_Y(y,f(x'))=\mid \widehat{d}_Y(y,f(x'))-\widehat{d}_X(x',x')\mid \leq \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0<\varepsilon.$$

Since such x' always exists, this shows that f satisfies the condition (SI_1) of Def.2.22.

Step 4. Let $x_1,x_2\in X$. If $\widehat{d}_X(x_1,x_2)\neq \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1),f(x_2))$, then $(x_2,f(x_1))\in \widehat{C}_0$. Otherwise, by the fact that $(x_2,f(x_1))\notin \widehat{C}_0$ and $(x_i,f(x_i))\in \widehat{C}_0$ $(i=1,2)$, we get via Lemma 2.12 that $\widehat{d}_X(x_1,x_2)=\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1),f(x_2))$, a contradiction! so $(x_2,f(x_1))\in \widehat{C}_0$. Since $(x_1,f(x_1))\in \widehat{C}_0$, we have

$$\widehat{d}_X(x_1,x_2)=\mid \widehat{d}_X(x_1,x_2)-\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1),f(x_1))\mid \leq \mathrm{dis}\widehat{C}_0<\varepsilon.$$

This shows that f satisfies the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22.

To sum up, f is a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y. This proves (1).

(2) Let $f:X\longrightarrow Y$ be a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry. Define a subset $\widehat{C}_0(f)\subset X\times Y$ by

$$\widehat{C}_0(f)=\{(x,y)\in X\times Y \ : \ \widehat{d}_Y(y,f(x))\leq\varepsilon\}.$$

Step 1$'$. For any $x\in X$, obviously $(x,f(x))\in \widehat{C}_0(f)$. For any $y\in Y$, since $f(X)$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in Y, $\mathrm{dist}(y,f(X))<\varepsilon$, so there exists $x\in X$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(y,f(x))<\varepsilon$, and then $(x,y)\in \widehat{C}_0(f)$. So $\widehat{C}_0(f)$ is a *correspondence* between X and Y.

Step 2$'$. Let $(x_1,y_1),\ (x_2,y_2)\in \widehat{C}_0(f)$. Then $\widehat{d}_Y(y_1,f(x_1))\leq\varepsilon$ and $\widehat{d}_Y(y_2,f(x_2))\leq\varepsilon$.

Case A. We assume that $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1),f(x_2))>\varepsilon$. Then by the strong triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{d}_Y(y_1,y_2)&=\max\{\widehat{d}_Y(y_1,f(x_1)),\ \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1),f(x_2)),\ \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_2),y_2)\}\\&=\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1),f(x_2)).\qquad \text{So}\end{aligned}$$

$$| \widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) - \widehat{d}_Y(y_1, y_2) | = | \widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) - \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) | \leq \text{dis} f < \varepsilon.$$

Case B. We assume that $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \leq \varepsilon$, and discuss this case via the following two subcases:

Subcase B1. We assume that $\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) = \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2))$. Then since

$$\widehat{d}_Y(y_1, y_2) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(y_1, f(x_1)),\ \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)),\ \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_2), y_2)\} \leq \varepsilon,$$

we have $| \widehat{d}_Y(y_1, y_2) - \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) | \leq \varepsilon$, so $| \widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) - \widehat{d}_Y(y_1, y_2) | \leq \varepsilon$.

Subcase B2. We assume that $\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) \neq \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2))$. Then by the fact that f is a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry we get $\widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) < \varepsilon$ (via the condition (SI_2)). As above, $\widehat{d}_Y(y_1, y_2) \leq \varepsilon$. So $| \widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) - \widehat{d}_Y(y_1, y_2) | \leq \varepsilon$.

To sum up, we always have $| \widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) - \widehat{d}_Y(y_1, y_2) | \leq \varepsilon$ for all $(x_1, y_1),\ (x_2, y_2) \in \widehat{C}_0(f)$. This shows $\text{dis}\widehat{C}_0(f) \leq \varepsilon$.

Step $3'$. For $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, if $(x, y) \notin \widehat{C}_0(f)$, then $\widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)) > \varepsilon$. So by the condition (SI_1) for f, there exists an $x' \in X$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x')) < \varepsilon$ and $\widehat{d}_X(x, x') = \widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x))$. In particular, $(x', y) \in \widehat{C}_0(f)$. Moreover, $(x, f(x)) \in \widehat{C}_0(f)$. This shows $\widehat{C}_0(f)$ satisfying the condition (C_{NA}) of Def. 2.11, hence $\widehat{C}_0(f)$ is a *strong correspondence* between X and Y. Therefore by Theorem 2.14, we obtain $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \leq \text{dis}\widehat{C}_0(f) \leq \varepsilon$. This proves (2), and the proof of Theorem 2.23 is completed. $\square$

Corollary 2.24. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces. Then

$$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0\ :\ \text{there exists a } \textit{strong}\ \varepsilon-\text{isometry from } X \text{ to } Y\}.$$

Proof. Denote $d = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0\ :\ \text{there exists a } \textit{strong}\, \varepsilon-\text{isometry from } X \text{ to } Y\}$.

For any $\varepsilon > \widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y)$, by Theorem 2.23.(1), there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry from X to Y, so $d \leq \varepsilon$, and then $d \leq \widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y)$.

Conversely, for any $\varepsilon > d$, there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon'-$isometry from X to Y with $d \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$. So by Theorem 2.23.(2), we have $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \leq \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > d$ is arbitrary, we get $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \leq d$. Hence $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) = d$, and the proof is completed.

□

3. Strong Gromov-Hausdorff convergence

In this section, we consider the converging sequences in the collection of non-Archimedean metric spaces, especially in the non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff space $(\widehat{\Gamma}_c,\ \widehat{d}_{GH})$. Because there are two metrics $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ and d_{GH} as defined, to distinguish the convergence corresponding to them, we call the convergence under $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ the strong type, as stated precisely in the following

Definition 3.1. A sequence $\{X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of non-Archimedean metric spaces strongly converges to a non-Archimedean metric space X if $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n, X) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$. In this case, we will write $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$ and call X a strong Gromov-Hausdorff limit of $\{X_n\}$. If all X_n and X are compact, then the limit is unique up to an isometry since $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ is a metric on $\widehat{\Gamma}_c$.

As usual, if $d_{GH}(X_n, X) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$, then we write $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}} X$ and call X a Gromov-Hausdorff limit of $\{X_n\}$ (see [BBI, p.260]).

If $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$, then by Corollary 2.9, we have $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}} X$.

Example 3.2. Every compact non-Archimedean metric space $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ is a strong Gromov-Hausdorff limit of finite spaces.

Proof. This is a counterpart of Example 7.4.9 of [BBI], the proof is similar.

□

If we write $\widehat{\Gamma}_{c,f} = \{X : \ X \in \widehat{\Gamma}_c \text{ and } X \text{ is a finite set } \}$, then Example 3.2 shows that $\widehat{\Gamma}_{c,f}$ is dense in $\widehat{\Gamma}_c$ under the metric $\widehat{d}_{GH}$.

Likewise, as a corollary of Theorem 2.23, there is a similar criterion for the strong convergence corresponding to the usual one (see [BBI, p.260]) as follows:

Criterion 3.3. A sequence $\{X_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of non-Archimedean metric spaces strongly converges to a non-Archimedean metric space X if and only if there are a sequence $\{\varepsilon_n\}$ of positive real numbers and a sequence of maps $f_n : X_n \longrightarrow X$ (or alternatively, $f_n : X \longrightarrow X_n$) such that every f_n is a *strong* ε_n-isometry and $\varepsilon_n \longrightarrow 0$.

Proof. $\Longleftarrow$: For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varepsilon_n < \varepsilon$ for all $n > n_0$. Since every $f_n : X_n \longrightarrow X$ is a strong ε_n-isometry, by Theorem 2.23.(2), $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n, X) \leq \varepsilon_n < \varepsilon$, so $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$.

$\Longrightarrow$: If $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n, X) < \varepsilon$ for all $n > n_0$. So by Theorem 2.23.(1), there exists a strong $\varepsilon-$isometry $f_n : X \longrightarrow X_n$ for every $n > n_0$. By letting $\varepsilon \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$, we obtain the results. □

Now we define another tool, the *strong* ε *− approximation*, which will also be used in explicit computation of $\widehat{d}_{GH}$.

Definition 3.4. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two compact non-Archimedean metric spaces and $\varepsilon > 0$. We say X and Y are *strong* ε *− approximations* of each other if there exist finite collections of points $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ in X and Y, respectively, such that :

(1) The set $\{x_i \ : \ 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in X, and $\{y_i \ : \ 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in Y.

(2) $\widehat{d}_X(x_i, \ x_j) = \widehat{d}_Y(y_i, \ y_j)$ for all $i, \ j \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$.

Obviously, if X and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon-$ *approximations* of each other, then they are also $\varepsilon-$ *approximations* of each other in the sense of [BBI,Def.7.4.10].

Theorem 3.5. Let $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two compact non-Archimedean metric spaces.

(1) If X and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon-$*approximations* of each other, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \leq \varepsilon$.

(2) If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) < \varepsilon$, then X and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon-$ *approximations* of each other.

Proof. (1) Since X and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon-$ *approximations* of each other, by definition, there exist finite collections of points $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset X$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset Y$ such that conditions (1) and (2) in Def.3.4 hold. Denote $X_0 = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $Y_0 = \{y_i\}_{i=1}^N$, and define $C_0 = \{(x_i, y_i) \ : \ 1 \leq i \leq N\} \subset X_0 \times Y_0$. Obviously, C_0 is a *correspondence* between X_0 and Y_0, and $\mathrm{dis}(C_0) = 0$ via condition (2) of Def.3.4. Now for any $(x, y) \in X_0 \times Y_0 \setminus C_0$, we have $x = x_i$ and $y = y_j$ for some $i, j \in \{1, \cdots N\}$ and $i \neq j$, so $x_i \neq x_j$ and $y_i \neq y_j$, and then $\widehat{d}_{X_0}(x_i, x_j) = \widehat{d}_{Y_0}(y_i, y_j) > 0 = \mathrm{dis}(C_0)$. This shows that C_0 is a *strong correspondence* between X_0 and Y_0. Hence by Theorem 2.14, $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_0, Y_0) \leq \mathrm{dis}(C_0) = 0$. So $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_0, Y_0) = 0$. Since X_0 and Y_0 are $\varepsilon-$nets in X and Y, respectively, we have $\mathrm{dist}(x, X_0) < \varepsilon$ and $\mathrm{dist}(y, Y_0) < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in X$ and

$y \in Y$. So

$$\widehat{d}_{X,H}(X_0, X) = \max\{\sup_{x\in X} \mathrm{dist}(x, X_0),\ \sup_{x\in X_0} \mathrm{dist}(x, X)\} \le \varepsilon, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\widehat{d}_{Y,H}(Y_0, Y) = \max\{\sup_{y\in Y} \mathrm{dist}(y, Y_0),\ \sup_{y\in Y_0} \mathrm{dist}(y, Y)\} \le \varepsilon.$$

Hence $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_0, X) \le \widehat{d}_{X,H}(X_0, X) \le \varepsilon$ and $\widehat{d}_{GH}(Y_0, Y) \le \widehat{d}_{Y,H}(Y_0, Y) \le \varepsilon$. Therefore by prop.2.6 (Zarichnyi), we get

$$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \le \max\{\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, X_0),\ \widehat{d}_{GH}(X_0, Y_0),\ \widehat{d}_{GH}(Y_0, Y)\} \le \varepsilon.$$

This proves (1).

(2) If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) < \varepsilon$, then by Theorem 2.23.(1), there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry $f : X \longrightarrow Y$. For any $x \in X$, denote the ball $B_x(\varepsilon) = \{x' \in X \ :\ \widehat{d}_X(x, x') < \varepsilon\}$, which is both open and closed in X (see [Sc]). Then $X = \cup_{x\in X} B_x(\varepsilon)$. Since X is compact and non-Archimedean, we have $X = \sqcup_{i=1}^{N} B_{x_i}(\varepsilon)$ (the disjoint union) for a positive integer N. Let $X_0 = \{x_i :\ 1 \le i \le N\}$ and define $y_i = f(x_i) \in Y$ for every $i \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$. We denote $Y_0 = \{y_i :\ 1 \le i \le N\}$.

Now for any $x_i,\ x_j \in X_0$ with $i \ne j$, since $B_{x_i}(\varepsilon) \cap B_{x_j}(\varepsilon) = \emptyset$, we have $\widehat{d}_X(x_i,\ x_j) \ge \varepsilon$. Then by the fact that f is a strong $\varepsilon-$isometry we get $\widehat{d}_X(x_i,\ x_j) = \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_i),\ f(x_j)) = \widehat{d}_Y(y_i,\ y_j)$. So the condition (2) of Def.3.4 holds for X_0 and Y_0.

Moreover, for any $x \in X$, we have $x \in B_{x_i}(\varepsilon)$ for some $i \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$, so $\widehat{d}_X(x,\ x_i) < \varepsilon$. Then $\mathrm{dist}(x, X_0) \le \widehat{d}_X(x,\ x_i) < \varepsilon$. This shows that X_0 is an $\varepsilon-$net in X.

Furthermore, since $f(X)$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in Y, for any $y \in Y$, there exists an $x \in X$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)) < \varepsilon$. Let $x \in B_{x_i}(\varepsilon)$, then $\widehat{d}_X(x, x_i) < \varepsilon$. If $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), f(x_i)) \ge \varepsilon$, then by the condition (SI_1) of Def.2.22, there exists an $x' \in X$ such that $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \varepsilon$ and $\widehat{d}_X(x_i, x') = \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), f(x_i))(\ge \varepsilon)$. But $\widehat{d}_X(x, x') = \max\{\widehat{d}_X(x, x_i), \widehat{d}_X(x_i, x')\} =$

$\widehat{d}_X(x_i, x') \geq \varepsilon$, so by the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22, we get $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), f(x')) = \widehat{d}_X(x, x') \geq \varepsilon$, a contradiction! So we must have $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x), f(x_i)) < \varepsilon$. Then

$$\widehat{d}_Y(y, y_i) = \widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x_i)) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}_Y(y, f(x)),\ \widehat{d}_Y(f(x), f(x_i))\} < \varepsilon.$$

So $\operatorname{dist}(y, Y_0) \leq \widehat{d}_Y(y, y_i) < \varepsilon$. This shows that Y_0 is an $\varepsilon-$net in Y. So the condition (1) of Def.3.4 holds for X_0, Y_0. Therefore, X and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon -$ *approximations* of each other. This proves (2), and the proof of Theorem 3.5 is completed. $\square$

Corollary 3.6. For compact non-Archimedean metric spaces $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and X, $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$ if and only if, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, X_n and X are *strong* $\varepsilon -$ *approximations* of each other for all sufficiently large n.

Proof. If $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n, X) < \varepsilon$ for all $n > n_0$. So by Theorem 3.5.(2), X_n and X are *strong* $\varepsilon -$ *approximations* of each other for all $n > n_0$.

Conversely, if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, X_n and X are *strong* $\varepsilon -$ *approximations* of each other for all sufficiently large n, then by Theorem 3.5.(1), $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n, X) \leq \varepsilon$ for all sufficiently large n. This shows that $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$. $\square$

Corollary 3.7. For two compact non-Archimedean metric spaces $(X, \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y, \widehat{d}_Y)$,

$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0\ :\ X$ and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon -$ *aprroximations* of each other $\}$.

Proof. Denote

$$d = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0\ :\ X \text{ and } Y \text{ are } \textit{strong } \varepsilon - \textit{aprroximations} \text{ of each other }\}.$$

For any $\varepsilon > \widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y)$, by Theorem 3.5.(2), X and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon-$*approximations* of each other, so $d \le \varepsilon$, and then $d \le \widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y)$.

Conversely, for any $\varepsilon > d$, there exists $0 < \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ such that X and Y are *strong* $\varepsilon'-$ *approximations* of each other. So by Theorem 3.5.(1), we have $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \le \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$, this implies that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \le d$. Hence $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) = d$. $\square$

Based on Theorem 3.5, we can now establish the following Theorem of determining $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$, which is well compatible to Proposition 7.4.12 of [BBI] about the usual $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}} X$.

Theorem 3.8. For compact non-Archimedean metric spaces X and $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$, $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$ if and only if the following holds: for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a finite $\varepsilon-$net S in X and a finite $\varepsilon-$net S_n in each X_n such that $S_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} S$. Moreover, these $\varepsilon-$nets can be chosen so that, for all sufficiently large n, S_n have the same cardinality as S.

Note that for compact non-Archimedean metric spaces, Theorem 3.8 here and Proposition 7.4.12 of [BBI] are not equivalent, this is because $\widehat{d}_{GH}$ and d_{GH} are not equivalent (see Theorem 4.8 below). Difference between them can also be seen in their proofs.

Proof of Theorem 3.8. $\Longleftarrow$: If such $\varepsilon-$nets exist, then by Corollary 3.6, the fact that $S_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} S$ implies, for any $\delta > 0$, that S_n and S are *strong* $\delta-$ *approximations* of each other for all sufficiently large n. Denote

$$r_n = \min\{\widehat{d}_n(x,\ x')\ :\ x,\ x' \in S_n \text{ and } x \neq x'\},$$

$$r = \min\{\widehat{d}(x,\ x')\ :\ x,\ x' \in S \text{ and } x \neq x'\},$$

where $\widehat{d}_n$ and $\widehat{d}$ are the metrics of X_n and X, respectively. Then both $r_n > 0$ and

$r > 0$ because S_n and S are finite sets. Now we take a δ such that $0 < \delta < \min\{r, r_n\}$. Since S_n and S are *strong* $\delta-$*approximations* of each other for all sufficiently large n, there exist finite collections of points $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ in S_n and S, respectively, such that:

(1) The set $X_0 = \{x_i \ : \ 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ is a $\delta-$net in S_n, and $Y_0 = \{y_i \ : \ 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ is a $\delta-$net in S.

(2) $\widehat{d}_n(x_i,\ x_j) = \widehat{d}(y_i,\ y_j)$ for all $i,\ j \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$.

Then for every $x \in S_n,\ \mathrm{dist}(x, X_0) < \delta$. So there exists an $x_i \in X_0$ such that $\widehat{d}_n(x,\ x_i) < \delta < r_n$. Thus $x = x_i$ because we would have $r_n \leq \widehat{d}_n(x,\ x_i)$ if $x \neq x_i$. Hence $S_n = X_0$.

Similarly, for every $y \in S,\ \mathrm{dist}(y, Y_0) < \delta,$ so $\widehat{d}(y,\ y_i) < \delta < r$ for some $y_i \in Y_0$. Thus $y = y_i \in Y_0$, so $S = Y_0$. These facts together with the above condition (2) shows that $\sharp S_n = \sharp X_0 = \sharp Y_0 = \sharp S$ for all sufficiently large n.

Moreover, since S_n and S are finite $\varepsilon-$nets in X_n and X, respectively, the above discussion shows that X_n and X are *strong* $\varepsilon-$*approximations* of each other for all sufficiently large n. Hence by Corollary 3.6, $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$.

$\Longrightarrow$: If $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n, X) < \varepsilon$ for all sufficiently large n. Take a finite $\varepsilon-$net S in X (such S exists since X is compact, hence totally bounded). We may as well write $S = \{x_i \ : \ 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ with $N = \sharp S < \infty$. Denote

$$r = \min\{\widehat{d}(x,\ x') \ : \ x,\ x' \in S \text{ and } x \neq x'\}.$$

Then $r > 0$ since S is a finite set. By Criterion 3.3, there are a sequence of *strong* ε_n-isometries $f_n \ : \ X \longrightarrow X_n$ where $\varepsilon_n > 0$ and $\varepsilon_n \longrightarrow 0$. We may assume that all $\varepsilon_n < \min\{r, \varepsilon\}$. Then we define $S_n = f_n(S) \subset X_n$. Obviously, $f_n \ : \ S \longrightarrow S_n$

is an ε_n-isometry for every n.

Moreover, for $x',\ x'' \in S$, if $\widehat{d}(x',\ x'') \geq \varepsilon_n$, then $\widehat{d}(x',\ x'') = \widehat{d_n}(f_n(x'),\ f_n(x''))$ (via the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22).

Furthermore, let $x \in S$ and $y \in S_n$ satisfy $\widehat{d_n}(y, f_n(x)) > \varepsilon_n$. Firstly, we have $x = x_i$ and $y = f_n(x_j)$ for some $i,\ j \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$ with $i \neq j$. Then $\widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j) \geq r > \varepsilon_n$. So by the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22 for $f_n\ :\ X \longrightarrow X_n$, we have

$$\widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j) = \widehat{d_n}(f_n(x_i),\ f_n(x_j)) = \widehat{d_n}(y,\ f_n(x)).$$

also we have $\widehat{d_n}(y,\ f_n(x_j)) = \widehat{d_n}(f_n(x_j),\ f_n(x_j)) = 0 < \varepsilon_n$. So (via taking $x' = x_j$) the condition (SI_1) of Def.2.22 holds for $f_n\ :\ S \longrightarrow S_n$. This shows that $f_n\ :\ S \longrightarrow S_n$ is a *strong* ε_n-isometry for every n. Hence by Criterion 3.3, we obtain that $S_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} S$.

Lastly we come to prove that S_n is an $\varepsilon-$net in X_n for every n. We may as well assume that $\varepsilon_n < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. For every $x \in X_n$ since $f_n(X)$ is an ε_n-net in X_n, $\mathrm{dist}(x, f_n(X)) < \varepsilon_n$, so there exists an $x' \in X$ such that $\widehat{d_n}(x, f_n(x')) < \varepsilon_n$. Similarly, $\widehat{d}(x', x'') < \varepsilon$ for some $x'' \in S$ because S is an $\varepsilon-$net in X. Then we discuss into the following two cases:

Case A. If $\widehat{d}(x', x'') \geq \varepsilon_n$, then by the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22 for $f_n\ :\ X \longrightarrow X_n$, we have $\widehat{d_n}(f_n(x'),\ f_n(x'')) = \widehat{d}(x', x'') < \varepsilon$. Hence

$$\widehat{d_n}(x,\ f_n(x'')) \leq \max\{\widehat{d_n}(x,\ f_n(x')),\ \widehat{d_n}(f_n(x'),\ f_n(x''))\} < \varepsilon.$$

Since $f_n(x'') \in f_n(S) = S_n$, we get $\mathrm{dist}(x, S_n) \leq \widehat{d_n}(x,\ f_n(x'')) < \varepsilon$.

Case B. If $\widehat{d}(x', x'') < \varepsilon_n$, then since

$$| \ \widehat{d}(x', \ x'') \ - \ \widehat{d_n}(f_n(x'), \ f_n(x'')) \ | \leq \mathrm{dis} f_n < \varepsilon_n, \ \text{we have}$$

$$\widehat{d_n}(f_n(x'), \ f_n(x'')) < \varepsilon_n + \widehat{d}(x', \ x'') < 2\varepsilon_n < \varepsilon.$$

$$\text{So} \quad \widehat{d_n}(x, \ f_n(x'')) \leq \max\{\widehat{d_n}(x, \ f_n(x')), \ \widehat{d_n}(f_n(x'), \ f_n(x''))\} < \varepsilon.$$

Since $f_n(x'') \in f_n(S) = S_n$, we get $\mathrm{dist}(x, \ S_n) \leq \widehat{d_n}(x, \ f_n(x'')) < \varepsilon$.

Thus Case A and Case B together show that $\mathrm{dist}(x, \ S_n) < \varepsilon$ for all $x \in X_n$. So S_n is an $\varepsilon-$net in X_n. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.8. $\square$

Theorem 3.9. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of non-Archimedean metric spaces, and let $X = \{x_i \ : \ 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ be a finite non-Archimedean metric space of cardinality N. Then $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$ if and only if the following holds:

For all sufficiently large n, X_n can be split into a disjoint union of N non-empty sets $X_{n,1}, \ X_{n,2}, \ \cdots, \ X_{n,N}$ so that for all $i, \ j$,

$\mathrm{diam}(X_{n,i}) \longrightarrow 0, \quad \mathrm{dist}(X_{n,i}, \ X_{n,j}) = \widehat{d}(x_i, \ x_j) \quad (n \longrightarrow \infty),$

where $\widehat{d}$ is the metric on X and $\widehat{d_n}$ is the metric on X_n for each n.

Proof. Denote $r_0 = \min\{\widehat{d}(x_i, x_j) \ : \ 1 \leq i, \ j \leq N \text{ and } i \neq j\}$. Then $r_0 > 0$.

$\Longrightarrow$: We assume that $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$. Then for any $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{r_0}{2}$, there exists a $n_0(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n, X) < \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$. By Theorem 2.23.(1), there exists a strong $\varepsilon-$isometry $f_{n, \ \varepsilon} \ : \ X_n \longrightarrow X$ for every $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$. We claim that each $f_{n, \ \varepsilon}$ is surjective. If otherwise, then we may as well assume that $x_N \notin f_{n, \ \varepsilon}(X_n)$. Then $\mathrm{dist}(x_N, \ f_{n, \ \varepsilon}(X_n)) \geq r_0 > \varepsilon$, so $f_{n, \ \varepsilon}(X_n)$ is not an $\varepsilon-$net in X. A contradiction! Therefore $f_{n, \ \varepsilon}$ must be surjective for every $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$. Denote

$$X_{n, \ i, \ \varepsilon} = f_{n, \ \varepsilon}^{-1}(x_i) = \{x \in X_n \ : \ f_{n, \ \varepsilon}(x) = x_i\}.$$

Then $X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$ and $X_n = \sqcup_{1\leq i\leq N} X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon}$ is the disjoint union of all $X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon}$ $(1 \leq i \leq N)$. Since $f_{n,\ \varepsilon}(X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon}) = \{x_i\}$ for each i, for any $x',\ x'' \in X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon}$, we have

$$\widehat{d}_n(x',\ x'') = |\ \widehat{d}_n(x',\ x'')\ -\ \widehat{d}(f_{n,\ \varepsilon}(x'),\ f_{n,\ \varepsilon}(x''))\ | \leq \mathrm{dis} f_{n,\ \varepsilon} < \varepsilon,$$

so $\mathrm{diam}(X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon}) \leq \mathrm{dis} f_{n,\ \varepsilon} < \varepsilon$ for all $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$.

Furthermore, let $y' \in X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon},\ y'' \in X_{n,\ j,\ \varepsilon}$ $(i \neq j)$, then $f_{n,\ \varepsilon}(y') = x_i$ and $f_{n,\ \varepsilon}(y'') = x_j$. Since

$$|\ \widehat{d}_n(y',\ y'')\ -\ \widehat{d}(f_{n,\ \varepsilon}(y'),\ f_{n,\ \varepsilon}(y''))\ | = |\ \widehat{d}_n(y',\ y'')\ -\ \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j)\ | \leq \mathrm{dis} f_{n,\ \varepsilon} < \varepsilon,$$

we have $\widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j) - \varepsilon < \widehat{d}_n(y',\ y'') < \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j) + \varepsilon$, so $\widehat{d}_n(y',\ y'') > \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j) - \varepsilon \geq r_0 - \varepsilon > 2\varepsilon - \varepsilon = \varepsilon$. Then by the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22, we get $\widehat{d}_n(y',\ y'') = \widehat{d}(f_{n,\ \varepsilon}(y'),\ f_{n,\ \varepsilon}(y'')) = \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j)$. Therefore

$$\mathrm{dist}(X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon},\ X_{n,\ j,\ \varepsilon}) = \inf\{\widehat{d}_n(y',\ y'')\ :\ y' \in X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon},\ y'' \in X_{n,\ j,\ \varepsilon}\} = \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j).$$

To sum up, we have obtain the following

Conclusion. For any $0 < \varepsilon < r_0/2$, there exists a $n_0(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon)$, we have $X_n = \sqcup_{1\leq i\leq N} X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon}$ (the disjoint union) with non-empty sets $X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon}$ $(1 \leq i \leq N)$ satisfying $\mathrm{diam}(X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon}) < \varepsilon$ and $\mathrm{dist}(X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon},\ X_{n,\ j,\ \varepsilon}) = \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j)$.

Now we take a sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of positive real numbers such that $\varepsilon_k < r_0/2$ for all k and $\varepsilon_k \longrightarrow 0$ as $k \longrightarrow \infty$. Then for each ε_k, we have a $n_0(\varepsilon_k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the above Conclusion holds for all $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon_k)$.

Case A. If $\{n_0(\varepsilon_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is bounded, then there exists a $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n_0(\varepsilon_k) < m_0$ for all k. So for each ε_k, the above Conclusion holds for all $n \geq m_0$. Now for each

$n \geq m_0$ and $1 \leq i \leq N$, we take $X_{n,\ i} = X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon_n}$. Then we obtain a split for all $n \geq m_0$ satisfying

$X_n = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon_n} = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} X_{n,\ i}$,

$\mathrm{diam}(X_{n,\ i}) = \mathrm{diam}(X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon_n}) < \varepsilon_n \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$, and

$\mathrm{dist}(X_{n,\ i},\ X_{n,\ j}) = \mathrm{dist}(X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon_n},\ X_{n,\ j,\ \varepsilon_n}) = \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j)$.

Case B. If $\{n_0(\varepsilon_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is unbounded, then without loss of generality, we may assume $n_0(\varepsilon_1) < n_0(\varepsilon_2) < \cdots$ and $n_0(\varepsilon_k) \longrightarrow \infty$ as $k \longrightarrow \infty$. Now for each $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $n \geq n_0(\varepsilon_1)$, we take

$X_{n,\ i} = X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon_k}$ if $n_0(\varepsilon_k) \leq n < n_0(\varepsilon_{k+1})$.

Then obviously we have

$X_n = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon_k} = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} X_{n,\ i}$,

$\mathrm{diam}(X_{n,\ i}) = \mathrm{diam}(X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon_k}) < \varepsilon_k \longrightarrow 0 \quad (n \longrightarrow \infty)$, and

$\mathrm{dist}(X_{n,\ i},\ X_{n,\ j}) = \mathrm{dist}(X_{n,\ i,\ \varepsilon_k},\ X_{n,\ j,\ \varepsilon_k}) = \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j)$.

This proves the necessity.

$\Longleftarrow$: Now we assume such split exists, i.e., for all sufficiently large n, $X_n = \sqcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} X_{n,\ i}$ with the given properties. Then we define a map $f_n :\ X_n \longrightarrow X$ by $f_n(x') = x_i$ if $x' \in X_{n,\ i} \quad (i \in \{1, \cdots, N\})$. Then $f_n(X_{n,\ i}) = \{x_i\}$. Obviously f_n is surjective.

For any $0 < \varepsilon < r_0/2$, there exists a $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathrm{diam}(X_{n,\ i}) < \varepsilon$ for every i and all $n > n_0$. Then by the fact that $\mathrm{dist}(X_{n,\ i},\ X_{n,\ j}) = \widehat{d}(x_i, x_j) \geq r_0 > \varepsilon\ (i \neq j)$ and the strong triangle inequality, we can easily obtain that $\widehat{d_n}(x',\ x'') = \widehat{d}(x_i, x_j)$

for any $x' \in X_{n,\ i}$ and $x'' \in X_{n,\ j}$ $(i \neq j)$. From this we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{dis} f_n &= \sup\{|\ \widehat{d}_n(x',\ x'')\ -\ \widehat{d}(f_n(x'),\ f_n(x''))\ |\ :\ x',\ x'' \in X_n\}\\ &= \sup\{|\ \widehat{d}_n(x',\ x'')\ |\ :\ x',\ x'' \in X_{n,\ i} \quad (1 \leq i \leq N)\}\\ &= \max\{\mathrm{diam}(X_{n,\ i})\ :\ 1 \leq i \leq N\} < \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Because f_n is surjective, so f_n is an $\varepsilon-$isometry for every $n > n_0$.

Now let $x \in X_n$ and $y \in X$, then $x \in X_{n,i}$ and $y = f_n(x')$ with $x' \in X_{n,j}$ for some $i,\ j \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$. If $\widehat{d}(y, f_n(x)) \geq \varepsilon$, i.e., $\widehat{d}(f_n(x'), f_n(x)) \geq \varepsilon$, then $\widehat{d}(x_i, x_j) = \widehat{d}(f_n(x'), f_n(x)) \geq \varepsilon$, so $i \neq j$. Hence as above discussed,

$$\widehat{d}_n(x,\ x') = \mathrm{dist}(X_{n,i},\ X_{n,j}) = \widehat{d}(x_i, x_j) = \widehat{d}(y, f_n(x)).$$

So the condition (SI_1) of Def.2.22 holds for f_n.

Next let $x',\ x'' \in X_n$, then $x' \in X_{n,i}$ and $x'' \in X_{n,j}$ for some $i,\ j \in \{1, \cdots, N\}$. If $\widehat{d}_n(x',\ x'') \geq \varepsilon$, then $i \neq j$. So $\widehat{d}_n(x',\ x'') = \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j) = \widehat{d}(f_n(x'),\ f_n(x''))$. So the condition (SI_2) of Def. 2.22 holds for f_n. Therefore, for all $n > n_0, f_n$ is a strong $\varepsilon-$isometry from X_n to X. Hence by Theorem 2.23.(2), we obtain that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n, X) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $n > n_0$. This shows that $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$, and the proof of Theorem 3.9 is completed. $\square$

Note added for the proof of Theorem 3.9.

If we assume that X_n and X are compact, then we can prove the sufficiency of Theorem 3.9 as follows:

$\Longleftarrow$: Take $X'_n = \{x'_1,\ \cdots,\ x'_N\} \subset X_n$ by choosing one element $x'_i \in X_{n,\ i}$ for each $i \in \{1,\ \cdots,\ N\}$. Then it is easy to see that X'_n is an $\varepsilon-$net in X_n and

$\widehat{d}_n(x_i',\ x_j') = \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j)$ for all i, j. So X_n and X are *strong* $\varepsilon -$ *approximations* of each other. Therefore by Theorem 3.5.(1), we have $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n, X) \leq \varepsilon$. $\square$

Definition 3.10. Let (X, d_X) be a metric space and S be a non-empty subset of X. We denote

$$W_X(S) = \{d_X(x,\ y) :\ x,\ y \in S \text{ and } x \neq y\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\},$$

and write $\omega_0 = \inf\{\alpha :\ \alpha \in W_X(S)\}$, $\quad \omega_1 = \sup\{\alpha :\ \alpha \in W_X(S)\}$. We call $W_X(S)$ the metric weight set associated to S in X.

Definition 3.11. We say that a class $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{sut}$ of compact non-Archimedean metric spaces is *strongly uniformly totally bounded* if the following holds:
For every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer number $N = N(\varepsilon)$ and a finite set $R(\varepsilon) \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ of positive real numbers such that every $X \in \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{sut}$ contains an $\varepsilon-$net $S_{(X)}$ consisting of no more than N points and $W_X(S_{(X)}) \subset R(\varepsilon)$.

Now we establish the following compactness Theorem for the class $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{sut}$ under $\widehat{d}_{GH}$. For the corresponding theorem about *uniformly totally bounded* class of compact metric spaces under d_{GH}, see [BBI, Thm.7.4.15].

Theorem 3.12 (Compactness Theorem).
Any *strongly uniformly totally bounded* class $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{sut}$ of compact non-Archimedean metric spaces is pre-compact in the strong Gromov-Hausdorff topology. That is, any sequence of elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{sut}$ contains a Cauchy subsequence under the metric $\widehat{d}_{GH}$.

Proof. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence in $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_{sut}$, we denote by $\widehat{d}_n$ the metric of X_n. In every space X_n, there exists an $1-$net $T_n^{(1)} = S_n^{(1)}$ consisting of no more than

$N_1 = N_1(1)$ points, and $W_{X_n}(S_n^{(1)}) \subset R(1)$. Let $n_1 = \sharp S_n^{(1)} \leq N_1$, and write

$$S_n^{(1)} =\{x_{n,\ 1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ n_1},\ x_{n,\ n_1+1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ N_1}\} \quad \text{with}$$

$$x_{n,\ n_1} = x_{n,\ n_1+1} = \cdots = x_{n,\ N_1}.$$

Likewise, X_n contains a $1/2-$net $S_n^{(2)}$ with $\sharp S_n^{(2)} = n_2 \leq N(1/2) = N_2$ and $W_{X_n}(S_n^{(2)}) \subset R(1/2)$. Denote $T_n^{(2)} = T_n^{(1)} \cup S_n^{(2)}$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} &T_n^{(2)} \\ &= \{x_{n,\ 1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ N_1},\ x_{n,\ N_1+1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ N_1+n_2},\ x_{n,\ N_1+n_2+1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ N_1+N_2}\} \\ &\text{with} \quad S_n^{(2)} = \{x_{n,\ N_1+1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ N_1+n_2}\} \\ &\text{and} \quad x_{n,\ N_1+n_2} = x_{n,\ N_1+n_2+1} = \cdots = x_{n,\ N_1+N_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $T_n^{(2)}$ is also a $1/2-$net in X_n. Follows this way, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &T_n^{(k)} \\ &= \{x_{n,\ 1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ L_{k-1}},\ x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+n_k},\ x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+n_k+1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+N_k}\}, \\ &\text{where} \quad x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+n_k} = x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+n_k+1} = \cdots = x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+N_k}, \\ &\text{and} \quad S_n^{(k)} = \{x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+1},\ \cdots,\ x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+n_k}\} \end{aligned}$$

is a $1/k-$net in X_n with $n_k = \sharp S_n^{(k)} \leq N(1/k) = N_k$, and $W_{X_n}(S_n^{(k)}) \subset R(1/k)$, and $L_k = N_1 + N_2 + \cdots + N_k$.

Obviously, $T_n^{(k)}$ is a $1/k-$net in X_n and $T_n^{(k)} = T_n^{(k-1)} \cup S_n^{(k)} = S_n^{(1)} \cup S_n^{(2)} \cup \cdots \cup S_n^{(k)}$. Let $k \longrightarrow \infty$, we obtain a countable dense subset $T_n = \{x_{n,\ i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset X_n$ such that for every k, the first L_k points of T_n form a $1/k-$net in X_n (some points in T_n may coincide). The density is easy to see, since for every $x \in X_n$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varepsilon > 1/k$ and then $\operatorname{dist}(x,\ S_n^{(k)}) < 1/k < \varepsilon$, hence $\operatorname{dist}(x,\ T_n) < \varepsilon$

because $S_n^{(k)} \subset T_n$.

Denote $D = \max\{1,\ \max\{a:\ \ a \in R(1)\}\}$. Then for any $x',\ x'' \in X_n$, we have $\operatorname{dist}(x',\ S_n^{(1)}) < 1$ and $\operatorname{dist}(x'',\ S_n^{(1)}) < 1$, so there exist $y_1,\ y_2 \in S_n^{(1)}$ such that $\widehat{d}_n(x',\ y_1) < 1$ and $\widehat{d}_n(x'',\ y_2) < 1$. Then

$$\widehat{d}_n(x',\ x'') \le \max\{\widehat{d}_n(x',\ y_1),\ \widehat{d}_n(y_1,\ y_2),\ \widehat{d}_n(y_2,\ x'')\} \le D$$

because $W_{X_n}(S_n^{(1)}) \subset R(1)$. This is independent of n. Therefore, for each pair $(i,\ j)$, $\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j}) \le D$, i.e., $\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j}) \in [0,\ D]$, the compact interval. Hence the sequence $\{\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j})\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ contains a converging subsequence. Then using the Cantor diagonal procedure, we can extract a subsequence of $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in which $\{\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j})\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges for all $i,\ j$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that they converge without passing to a subsequence. Now we come to construct a complete non-Archimedean metric space $\overline{X}$ as follows:

Pick an abstract countable set $X = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and define a function $\widehat{d}$ on $X \times X$ by

$$\widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j) = \lim_{n \longrightarrow \infty} \widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j}) \quad (\forall\ i,\ j \in \mathbb{N}).$$

For any x_k, since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j}) \le \max\{\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ k}),\ \widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ k},\ x_{n,\ j})\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ k}) + \widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ k},\ x_{n,\ j})) + \frac{1}{2} \mid \widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ k}) - \widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ k},\ x_{n,\ j}) \mid,
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j) &\leq \frac{1}{2}(\lim_{n\longrightarrow\infty}\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ k}) + \lim_{n\longrightarrow\infty}\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ k},\ x_{n,\ j}))\\ &+\frac{1}{2}\mid \lim_{n\longrightarrow\infty}\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ k}) - \lim_{n\longrightarrow\infty}\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ k},\ x_{n,\ j})\mid\\ &=\frac{1}{2}(\widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_k)+\widehat{d}(x_k,\ x_j))+\frac{1}{2}\mid\widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_k)-\widehat{d}(x_k,\ x_j)\mid\\ &=\max\{\widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_k),\ \widehat{d}(x_k,\ x_j)\}.\end{aligned}$$

So $\widehat{d}$ satisfies the strong triangle inequality. The symmetry is obvious, so $\widehat{d}$ is a non-Archimedean semi-metric on X, and then the quotient space $X/\widehat{d}$ is a non-Archimedean metric space. We will denote by $\overline{x}_i$ the point of $X/\widehat{d}$ obtained from x_i. $X/\widehat{d}$ may not be complete, so let $\overline{X}$ be the completion of $X/\widehat{d}$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and take a $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1/k < \varepsilon$. We consider the set $\overline{T}^{(k)} = \{\overline{x}_i : 1 \leq i \leq L_k\}$ with L_k as above. For any $\overline{x} \in X/\widehat{d},\ \overline{x} = \overline{x}_j$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for $x_{n,\ j} \in T_n \subset X_n,$ since $T_n^{(k)}$ is a $1/k-$net in X_n, there exist some $l \leq L_k$ such that $\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ j},\ x_{n,\ l}) < 1/k$. Since L_k is independent of n, there exists a $l \leq L_k$ such that $\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ j},\ x_{n,\ l}) < 1/k$ for infinitely many indices n. Then $\widehat{d}(x_j,\ x_l) = \lim_{n\longrightarrow\infty}\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ j},\ x_{n,\ l}) \leq 1/k$ (the limit of a converging sequence is equal to the limit of its any subsequence). So $\widehat{d}(\overline{x},\overline{x}_l) = \widehat{d}(\overline{x}_j,\overline{x}_l) = \widehat{d}(x_j,x_l) < \varepsilon$. This shows that $\overline{T}^{(k)}$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in $X/\widehat{d}$. Since $X/\widehat{d}$ is dense in $\overline{X}$, for any $\overline{x} \in \overline{X}$, there exists an $\overline{x}' \in X/\widehat{d}$ such that $\widehat{d}(\overline{x},\ \overline{x}') < \varepsilon$. For such $\overline{x}',\ \mathrm{dist}(\overline{x}',\ \overline{T}^{(k)}) < \varepsilon$, so there exists an $\overline{x}_i \in \overline{T}^{(k)}$ such that $\widehat{d}(\overline{x}',\ \overline{x}_i) < \varepsilon$. Hence $\widehat{d}(\overline{x},\ \overline{x}_i) \leq \max\{\widehat{d}(\overline{x},\ \overline{x}'),\ \widehat{d}(\overline{x}',\ \overline{x}_i)\} < \varepsilon$, which shows that $\overline{T}^{(k)}$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in $\overline{X}$. Thus $\overline{X}$ is totally bounded because $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, hence $\overline{X}$ is compact since it is complete. Therefore, $(\overline{X},\ \widehat{d})$ is a compact non-Archimedean metric space, i.e., its isometry class belongs to $\widehat{\Gamma}_c$.

Furthermore, for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1/k < \varepsilon$ as above, we consider the sets $S_n^{(k)} = \{x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+1}, \cdots, x_{n,\ L_{k-1}+n_k}\} \subset T_n^k$ for every n as before. Since $N_k = N(1/k)$ is independent of n and $n_k = \sharp S_n^{(k)} \leq N_k$, there exists a positive integer $N' \leq N_k$ such that $n_k = N'$ for infinitely many n. So we may as well assume that $n_k = N'$ for all n.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\sharp R(1/k) > 1$, and then define $r_k = \min\{|\ a - b\ | :\ a,\ b \in R(1/k) \text{ and } a \neq b\}$. Obviously, $r_k > 0$.

Define $\overline{S}^{(k)} = \{\overline{x}_i :\ L_{k-1} + 1 \leq i \leq L_{k-1} + N'\} \subset \overline{X}$, where $L_{k-1} = N_1 + N_2 + \cdots + N_{k-1}$ is independent of n as above. For any $\overline{x} \in X/\widehat{d}$, $\overline{x} = \overline{x}_j$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $S_n^{(k)}$ is a $1/k-$net in X_n for every n, and $x_{n,\ j} \in T_n \subset X_n$, there exist some $l_n :\ L_{k-1} + 1 \leq l_n \leq L_{k-1} + N'$ such that $\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ j},\ x_{n,\ l_n}) < 1/k$, and then there exist at least one l such that $L_{k-1} + 1 \leq l \leq L_{k-1} + N'$ and $\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ j},\ x_{n,\ l}) < 1/k$ for infinitely many indices n. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{d}(x_j,\ x_l) = \lim_{n \longrightarrow \infty} \widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ j},\ x_{n,\ l}) \leq \frac{1}{k} < \varepsilon, \quad \text{so} \\
&\widehat{d}(\overline{x},\ \overline{x}_l) = \widehat{d}(\overline{x}_j,\ \overline{x}_l) = \widehat{d}(x_j,\ x_l) < \varepsilon, \quad \text{and then} \\
&\operatorname{dist}(\overline{x},\ \overline{S}^{(k)}) \leq \widehat{d}(\overline{x},\ \overline{x}_l) < \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\overline{S}^{(k)}$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in $X/\widehat{d}$. Because $X/\widehat{d}$ is dense in $\overline{X}$, like the above proof for $\overline{T}^{(k)}$, one can show that $\overline{S}^{(k)}$ is also an $\varepsilon-$net in $\overline{X}$.

Now for any $i,\ j :\ L_{k-1} + 1 \leq i,\ j \leq L_{k-1} + N'$ and $i \neq j$, we have as before $\widehat{d}(\overline{x}_i,\ \overline{x}_j) = \widehat{d}(x_i,\ x_j) = \lim_{n \longrightarrow \infty} \widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j})$ with $x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j} \in S_n^{(k)}$. Then for any $0 < \delta < r_k$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n_1,\ n_2 > n_0$ we have

$$|\ \widehat{d}_{n_1}(x_{n_1,\ i},\ x_{n_1,\ j}) - \widehat{d}_{n_2}(x_{n_2,\ i},\ x_{n_2,\ j})\ | < \delta.$$

Since $\widehat{d}_{n_1}(x_{n_1,\ i},\ x_{n_1,\ j}) \in W_{X_{n_1}}(S^{(k)}_{n_1}) \subset R(1/k)$ and $\widehat{d}_{n_2}(x_{n_2,\ i},\ x_{n_2,\ j}) \in W_{X_{n_2}}(S^{(k)}_{n_2}) \subset R(1/k)$, we obtain that

$\widehat{d}_{n_1}(x_{n_1,\ i},\ x_{n_1,\ j}) = \widehat{d}_{n_2}(x_{n_2,\ i},\ x_{n_2,\ j})$ or $\mid \widehat{d}_{n_1}(x_{n_1,\ i},\ x_{n_1,\ j}) - \widehat{d}_{n_2}(x_{n_2,\ i},\ x_{n_2,\ j}) \mid \geq r_k$.

But $\delta < r_k$, so we must have
$\widehat{d}_{n_1}(x_{n_1,\ i},\ x_{n_1,\ j}) = \widehat{d}_{n_2}(x_{n_2,\ i},\ x_{n_2,\ j})$ for all $n_1,\ n_2 > n_0$. This shows that $\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j}) = \widehat{d}(\overline{x}_i,\ \overline{x}_j)$ for all sufficiently large n. Since the number of such pairs $(i,\ j)$ is finite, it follows that, for all sufficiently large n, $\widehat{d}_n(x_{n,\ i},\ x_{n,\ j}) = \widehat{d}(\overline{x}_i,\ \overline{x}_j)$ for all $i,\ j$ satisfying $L_{k-1}+1 \leq i,\ j \leq L_{k-1}+N'$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.9, we get $S^{(k)}_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} \overline{S}^{(k)}$. Since $S^{(k)}_n$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in X_n for every n, and $\overline{S}^{(k)}$ is an $\varepsilon-$net in $\overline{X}$, by Theorem 3.8, we obtain that $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} \overline{X}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.12. $\square$

4. Computing the Non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff distance

Definition 4.1. Let (X, d_X) be a metric space and S be a non-empty subset of X, $W_X(S)$ is the metric weight set associated to S in X as before. Let $\varepsilon > 0$, we define

$$W_X(S)_{\geq\varepsilon} = \{d_X(x,\ y):\ x,\ y \in S \text{ and } d_X(x,\ y) \geq \varepsilon\} = W_X(S) \cap [\varepsilon,\ \infty].$$

Theorem 4.2. Let $(X,\ \widehat{d}_X)$ and $(Y,\ \widehat{d}_Y)$ be two non-Archimedean metric spaces and denote $D = \max\{\mathrm{diam}(X),\ \mathrm{diam}(Y)\}$. Then

(1) $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) \geq \inf\{\varepsilon > 0:\ W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} = W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}\}$.

(2) If there does not exist $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} = W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}$, then

$\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) = \infty$.

(3A) If $D < +\infty$, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) \leq D$.

(3B) If $D < +\infty$ and $\mathrm{diam}(X) \neq \mathrm{diam}(Y)$, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) = D$.

Proof. We denote $d = \inf\{\varepsilon > 0 :\ W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} = W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}\}$.

(1) If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) = +\infty$, then we are done. So we assume that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) < +\infty$. For any $\varepsilon > \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y)$, we need to prove that $W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} = W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}$.
If both $W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} = \emptyset$ and $W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon} = \emptyset$, then we are done. So we may as well assume that $W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$. By Theorem 2.23.(1), there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry $f :\ X \longrightarrow Y$. Let $r \in W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon}$, then $r = \widehat{d}_X(x_1, x_2) \geq \varepsilon$ for some $x_1,\ x_2 \in X$. So by the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22, we have $r = \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) \in W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}$. This shows that $W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} \subset W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}$, in particular $W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon} \neq \emptyset$.
From $\widehat{d}_{GH}(Y,\ X) = \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) < \varepsilon$, there also exists by Theorem 2.23.(1) a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry $g :\ Y \longrightarrow X$. Let $r' \in W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}$, then $r' = \widehat{d}_Y(y_1,\ y_2) \geq \varepsilon$ for some $y_1,\ y_2 \in Y$. So by the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22, we have $r' = \widehat{d}_X(g(y_1), g(y_2)) \in W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon}$. This shows that $W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon} \subset W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon}$. Hence $W_X(X)_{\geq\varepsilon} = W_Y(Y)_{\geq\varepsilon}$. Therefore, $d \leq \varepsilon$. Since $\varepsilon > \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y)$ is arbitrary, we get $d \leq \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y)$. This proves (1).

(2) Easily follows from (1).

(3A) We define a function $\widehat{d}$ on $Z \times Z$ with $Z = X \sqcup Y$ (disjoint union) as follows:
$\widehat{d}\mid_{X\times X} = \widehat{d}_X;\ \widehat{d}\mid_{Y\times Y} = \widehat{d}_Y$; and for any $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, define $\widehat{d}(x, y) = \widehat{d}(y, x) =$

D. Then it is easy to see that $\widehat{d}$ is an admissible non-Archimedean metric on Z. So

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) = \overline{\widehat{d}}_{GH}(X,\ Y) \le \widehat{d}_H(X,\ Y)\\ &= \max\{\sup_{x\in X}\operatorname{dist}(x,\ Y),\ \sup_{y\in Y}\operatorname{dist}(y,\ X)\}\\ &= \max\{D,\ D\} = D.\end{aligned}$$

This proves (3A).

(3B) By (3A), we have $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) \le D$. We may assume that $D = \operatorname{diam}(X) > \operatorname{diam}(Y)$. If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) < D$, then we can take an ε such that

$$\max\{\operatorname{diam}(Y),\ \widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y)\} < \varepsilon < D.$$

And then there exist $x_1,\ x_2 \in X$ such that $\widehat{d}_X(x_1,\ x_2) > \varepsilon$. By Theorem 2.23.(1), there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry $f:\ X \longrightarrow Y$. By the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22, we get $\widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1),\ f(x_2)) = \widehat{d}_X(x_1,\ x_2) > \varepsilon$, so $\operatorname{diam}(Y) \ge \widehat{d}_Y(f(x_1),\ f(x_2)) > \varepsilon$. A contradiction! Hence $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) = D$. This proves (3B). And the proof of Theorem 4.2 is completed. □

Question 4.3. When will the equality of Theorem 4.2.(1) hold ?

Theorem 4.4. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of non-Archimedean metric spaces with $\operatorname{diam}(X_n) < +\infty$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and X be a non-Archimedean metric space with $\operatorname{diam}(X) < +\infty$. If $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$, then

(1) If $\operatorname{diam}(X) = 0$, then $\operatorname{diam}(X_n) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.

(2) If $\operatorname{diam}(X) > 0$, then there exists a $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n > n_0$, $\operatorname{diam}(X_n) = \operatorname{diam}(X)$.

Proof. (1) If the conclusion that $\operatorname{diam}(X_n) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ does not hold, then there exists an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $N > n$ and $\mathrm{diam}(X_N) \geq \varepsilon_0$.

Since $X_n \longrightarrow_{\mathrm{GH}_S} X$, for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0/2$, there exists a $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n > n_0$, $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n,\ X) < \varepsilon_0/2 = \varepsilon$. As discussed above, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $N > n_0$ such that $\mathrm{diam}(X_N) \geq \varepsilon_0 > 0$. But $\mathrm{diam}(X) = 0$, so by Theorem 4.2.(3B), $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_N,\ X) = \mathrm{diam}(X_N) \geq \varepsilon_0 > \varepsilon$. a contradiction! Hence $\mathrm{diam}(X_n) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$. This proves (1).

(2) Take $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{diam}(X) > 0$, then there exists a $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n > n_0$, $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n,\ X) < \varepsilon$, and then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X_n,\ X) < \max\{\mathrm{diam}(X_n),\ \mathrm{diam}(X)\}$ for all $n > n_0$. So by Theorem 4.2.(3B), we get $\mathrm{diam}(X_n) = \mathrm{diam}(X)$ for all $n > n_0$. This proves (2). And the proof of Theorem 4.4 is completed. □

Remark 4.5. For a sequence $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of non-Archimedean metric spaces with all $\mathrm{diam}(X_n) < +\infty$. By Theorem 4.4, we know that, if $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence under the non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff metric $\widehat{d}_{GH}$, then either $\mathrm{diam}(X_n) \longrightarrow 0$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ or there exists a $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathrm{diam}(X_N) = \mathrm{diam}(X_{N+i})$ for all $i = 1,\ 2,\ \cdots$.

Corollary 4.6. Let X be a non-Archimedean metric space with $\mathrm{diam}(X) < +\infty$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and Y be an $\varepsilon-$net in X. If $\varepsilon < \mathrm{diam}(X)$, then $\mathrm{diam}(Y) = \mathrm{diam}(X)$.

Proof. If $\mathrm{diam}(Y) \neq \mathrm{diam}(X)$, then $\mathrm{diam}(Y) < \mathrm{diam}(X)$, so by Theorem 4.2.(3B), $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) = \mathrm{diam}(X)$. But by Example 2.2 we know that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y) \leq \varepsilon$. A contradiction! □

The following are some examples on computing $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X,\ Y)$ in the local fields by using the above tools.

To begin with, as before, let p and q be two distinct rational prime numbers, $\mathbb{C}_p$ and $\mathbb{C}_q$ be the corresponding Tate fields endowed with the non-Archimedean metrics $\widehat{d_p}$ and $\widehat{d_q}$ respectively, where $\widehat{d_p}$ and $\widehat{d_q}$ are induced by the corresponding normalized non-Archimedean absolute values $|\cdot|_p$ and $|\cdot|_q$ (i.e., $\mid p \mid_p = \frac{1}{p}$ and $\mid q \mid_q = \frac{1}{q}$). We fix an embedding of $\mathbb{Q}_p$ into $\mathbb{C}_p$, similarly for $\mathbb{Q}_q$ into $\mathbb{C}_q$. Let $F \subset \mathbb{C}_p$ and $K \subset \mathbb{C}_q$ be local fields with $[F : \mathbb{Q}_p] = m$ and $[K : \mathbb{Q}_q] = n$, respectively. We denote

$\mathcal{O}_F$ the ring of integers of F; $U_F = \mathcal{O}_F^*$ the unit group of $\mathcal{O}_F$;

$\mathcal{M}_F = \pi_F \mathcal{O}_F$ the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_F$ with the uniformizer π_F for $\mathcal{O}_F$;

$k_F = \mathcal{O}_F/\mathcal{M}_F$ the residue field; e_F and f_F be the ramification index and residue degree, respectively. We have $e_F \cdot f_F = m$.

Likewise, for K, we denote

$\mathcal{O}_K$ the ring of integers of K; $U_K = \mathcal{O}_K^*$ the unit group of $\mathcal{O}_K$;

$\mathcal{M}_K = \pi_F \mathcal{O}_K$ the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_K$ with the uniformizer π_K for $\mathcal{O}_K$;

$k_K = \mathcal{O}_K/\mathcal{M}_K$ the residue field; e_K and f_K be the ramification index and residue degree, respectively. We have $e_K \cdot f_K = n$.

Obviously, we have $\mid \pi_F \mid_p = p^{-1/e_F}$ and $\mid \pi_K \mid_q = q^{-1/e_K}$.

(See [K], [L] and [Se] for these and relating facts.)

Example 4.7. (1) $\widehat{d}_{GH}(F,\ K) = \infty$. In fact, for any fields $F' \subset \mathbb{C}_p$ and $K' \subset \mathbb{C}_q$, we have $\widehat{d}_{GH}(F',\ K') = \infty$.

(2) $\widehat{d}_{GH}(\mathcal{O}_F,\ \mathcal{O}_K) = 1$.

(3) For any integers $s,\ t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\widehat{d}_{GH}(\mathcal{M}_F^s,\ \mathcal{M}_K^t) = \max\{p^{-s/e_F},\ q^{-t/e_K}\}$.

Proof. (1) If $\widehat{d}_{GH}(F,\ K) < \infty$, then $\widehat{d}_{GH}(F,\ K) < \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 1$. So by Theorem 2.23.(1), there exists a *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry $f:\ F \longrightarrow K$. Since $\mid F \mid_p = p^{\mathbb{Z}/e_F} \cup \{0\}$, there exists $x_1,\ x_2 \in F$ such that

$$\widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2) = \mid x_1 - x_2 \mid_p = (p^{-1/e_F})^{\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_F}(x_1 - x_2)} \geq \varepsilon.$$

Denote $\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_F}(x_1 - x_2) = -r \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2) = p^{r/e_F} \geq \varepsilon$. Then by the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22, we get $\widehat{d}_q(f(x_1),\ f(x_2)) = \widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2) = p^{r/e_F}$. Write $y_i = f(x_i) \in K$ $(i = 1,\ 2)$. Then $\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_K}(y_1 - y_2) = -r' \in \mathbb{Z}$, so $\widehat{d}_q(f(x_1),\ f(x_2)) = (q^{-1/e_K})^{\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_K}(y_1 - y_2)} = (q^{-1/e_K})^{-r'} = q^{r'/e_K}$. Thus we get $1 < p^{r/e_F} = q^{r'/e_K}$. Hence $1 < p^{r \cdot e_K} = q^{r' \cdot e_F}$. By the unique factorization of $\mathbb{Z}$, this is impossible because $p \neq q$. Therefore $\widehat{d}_{GH}(F,\ K) = \infty$. This proves (1).

(2) Firstly, since $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{O}_F) = \mathrm{diam}\mathcal{O}_K = 1$, by Theorem 4.2.(3A), we have $\widehat{d}_{GH}(\mathcal{O}_F,\ \mathcal{O}_K) \leq 1$.

Next we need to prove $\widehat{d}_{GH}(\mathcal{O}_F,\ \mathcal{O}_K) \geq 1$. To see this, let $f:\ \mathcal{O}_F \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ be any *strong* $\varepsilon-$isometry with $\varepsilon > 0$. We come to prove that $\varepsilon > 1$. Firstly, for the residue fields k_F and k_K as above, we have $\sharp k_F = p^{f_F}$ and $\sharp k_K = q^{f_K}$. Obviously $\sharp k_F \neq \sharp k_K$ because $p \neq q$. So we may as well assume that $\sharp k_F > \sharp k_K$. Take $A = \{a_1,\ a_2,\ \cdots,\ a_{p^{f_F}}\} \subset \mathcal{O}_F$ such that $k_F = \{\overline{a_1},\ \overline{a_2},\ \cdots,\ \overline{a_{p^{f_F}}}\}$ with $\overline{a_i} = a_i\ \mathrm{mod}\mathcal{M}_F$ for each i. Then for the map f above, since $\sharp k_F > \sharp k_K$, there exist $a_i,\ a_j \in \mathcal{O}_F$ with $i \neq j$ such that $f(a_i) \equiv f(a_j)\mathrm{mod}\mathcal{M}_K$. If $\varepsilon \leq 1$, then note that $\overline{a_i} \neq \overline{a_j}$, we have

$$\widehat{d}_p(a_i,\ a_j) = \mid a_i - a_j \mid_p = (p^{-1/e_F})^{\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_F}(a_i - a_j)} = 1 \geq \varepsilon,$$

so by the condition (SI_2) of Def.2.22, we have

$$\widehat{d}_q(f(a_i),\ f(a_j)) = \widehat{d}_p(a_i,\ a_j) = 1. \quad \text{But}$$

$$\widehat{d}_q(f(a_i),\ f(a_j)) = (q^{-1/e_K})^{\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_K}(f(a_i)-f(a_j))} \leq q^{-1/e_K} < 1.$$

A contradiction ! So we must have $\varepsilon > 1$. Then by Corollary 2.24, we get $\widehat{d}_{GH}(\mathcal{O}_F,\ \mathcal{O}_K) \geq 1$. Therefore, $\widehat{d}_{GH}(\mathcal{O}_F,\ \mathcal{O}_K) = 1$. This proves (2).

(3) If $s = t = 0$, then this is the above case (2). The other cases follow directly from Theorem 4.2.(3B) by the fact that $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{M}_F^s) = p^{-s/e_F} \neq q^{-t/e_K} = \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{M}_K^t))$. $\square$

Note added for Example 4.7. Similarly one can work out more other examples by the method used above.

Now we come to answer the above Question 2.17.

Theorem 4.8. The metric ratio function Υ_m is unbounded, in other words, for any $c \geq 2$, there exist non-Archimedean metric spaces X and Y such that $\widehat{d}_{GH}(X, Y) \geq c \cdot d_{GH}(X, Y)$.

Proof. We need to construct a series of such metric spaces X and Y. For $p-$adic integer ring $\mathbb{Z}_p$ and $q-$adic integer ring $\mathbb{Z}_q$ with rational primes $p > q$ as before. We first construct the following set

$$\mathbb{Z}_q^{\Delta} = \mathbb{Z}_q \sqcup \{t_q,\ \cdots,\ t_{p-1}\} \text{ (the disjoint union)}$$

with the $p - q$ number of indeterminate elements $t_q,\ \cdots,\ t_{p-1}$. Then we define a function $\widehat{d}_{\Delta}$ on $\mathbb{Z}_q^{\Delta} \times \mathbb{Z}_q^{\Delta}$ as follows:

$\widehat{d}_{\Delta}\mid_{Z_q \times Z_q} = \widehat{d}_q$; $\quad \widehat{d}_{\Delta}(t_i,\ t_i) = 0 \quad (\forall\, i \in \{q,\ \cdots,\ p-1\})$;

$\widehat{d}_\Delta(t_i,\ t_j) = 1 + \frac{1}{q}\quad (\forall\ i,\ j \in \{q,\ \cdots,\ p-1\}$ and $i \neq j)$;

$\widehat{d}_\Delta(t_i,\ a) = \widehat{d}_\Delta(a,\ t_i) = 1 + \frac{1}{q}\quad (\forall\ i \in \{q,\ \cdots,\ p-1\}$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}_q)$.

It is easy to verify that $\widehat{d}_\Delta$ is a non-Archimedean metric on $\mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta$.

Since $\mathrm{diam}(\mathbb{Z}_p) = 1$ and $\mathrm{diam}(\mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta) = 1 + \frac{1}{q}$, by Theorem 4.2.(3B), we get

$$\widehat{d}_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta) = 1 + \frac{1}{q}.$$

Next we come to prove that

$$d_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta) \leq \frac{1}{2q}.$$

To see this, we define a correspondence $\mathcal{C}$ between $\mathbb{Z}_p$ and $\mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta$ as follows:

Firstly, we have

$$\mathbb{Z}_p = \sqcup_{i=0}^{p-1} A_i \text{ (the disjoint union) with } A_i = i + p\mathbb{Z}_p$$

$$\mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta = (\sqcup_{i=0}^{q-1} B_i) \sqcup (\sqcup_{i=q}^{p-1} \{t_i\}) \text{ with } B_i = i + q\mathbb{Z}_q.$$

Then we set

$$\mathcal{C} = \cup_{i=0}^{q-1} (A_i \times B_i) \cup \cup_{i=q}^{p-1} (A_i \times \{t_i\}) \subset \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta.$$

Obviously $\mathcal{C}$ is a correspondence between $\mathbb{Z}_p$ and $\mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta$.

Assertion. we have $\mathrm{dis}\mathcal{C} \leq 1/q$.

To see this, for any $(x_1,\ y_1),\ (x_2,\ y_2) \in \mathcal{C}$, we discuss into the following cases:

(a) $x_1,\ x_2 \in A_i$.

(a_1) If $0 \leq i \leq q-1$, then $y_1,\ y_2 \in B_i$, so

$$|\ \widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2) - \widehat{d}_q(y_1,\ y_2)\ | \leq \max\{\mathrm{diam}(A_i),\ \mathrm{diam}(B_i)\} = \max\{\frac{1}{p},\ \frac{1}{q}\} = \frac{1}{q}.$$

(a_2) If $q \leq i \leq p-1$, then $y_1 = y_2 = t_i$, so $|\ \widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2) - \widehat{d}_\Delta(y_1,\ y_2)\ | = |\ \widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2)\ |$

$\leq \mathrm{diam}(A_i) = 1/p < 1/q$.

(b) $x_1 \in A_i$ and $x_2 \in A_j$ $(i \neq j)$.

(b$_1$) If $i,\ j \leq q-1$, then $y_1 \in B_i$ and $y_2 \in B_j$. So $|\ \widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2) - \widehat{d}_\Delta(y_1,\ y_2)\ | = |\ 1-1\ | = 0$.

(b$_2$) If $i,\ j > q-1$, then $y_1 = t_i$ and $y_2 = t_j$. So

$|\ \widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2) - \widehat{d}_\Delta(y_1,\ y_2)\ | = |\ 1 - \widehat{d}_\Delta(t_i,\ t_j)\ | = |\ 1-(1+\frac{1}{q})\ | = 1/q$.

(b$_3$) (The other cases) We may as well assume that $i \leq q-1$ and $j > q-1$, then $y_1 \in B_i$ and $y_2 = t_j$. So

$|\ \widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2) - \widehat{d}_\Delta(y_1,\ y_2)\ | = |\ 1-(1+\frac{1}{q})\ | = 1/q$.

To sum up, we obtain that

$$\mathrm{dis}\mathcal{C} = \sup\{|\ \widehat{d}_p(x_1,\ x_2) - \widehat{d}_\Delta(y_1,\ y_2)\ |:\ (x_1,\ y_1),\ (x_2,\ y_2) \in \mathcal{C}\} \leq \frac{1}{q}.$$

This proves the above assertion. So by Theorem 7.3.25 of [BBI, p.257], we get

$$d_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta) \leq \frac{1}{2}\ \mathrm{dis}\mathcal{C} \leq \frac{1}{2q}. \quad \text{Therefore,}$$

$$\Upsilon_m(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta) = \frac{\widehat{d}_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta)}{d_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta)} \geq \frac{1+\frac{1}{q}}{\frac{1}{2q}} = 2q+2 \longrightarrow \infty \text{ as } q \longrightarrow \infty.$$

This proves Theorem 4.8. $\square$

Remark 4.9. It is well known that $d_{GH}(X,\ Y) \geq \frac{1}{2}\ |\ \mathrm{diam}(X) - \mathrm{diam}(Y)\ |$ for any metric spaces X and Y with $\mathrm{diam}(X) < \infty$ (see Exercise 7.3.14 of [BBI, p.255]), so we have

$$d_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta) \geq \frac{1}{2}\ \ |\ \mathrm{diam}(\mathbb{Z}_p) - \mathrm{diam}(\mathbb{Z}_q^\Delta)\ | = \frac{1}{2}\ \ |\ \ 1-(1+\frac{1}{q})\ | = \frac{1}{2q}.$$

Hence by the computation result in the above Theorem 4.8, we obtain that

$$d_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^{\Delta}) = \frac{1}{2q}. \quad \text{Therefore,}$$

$$\Upsilon_m(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^{\Delta}) = \frac{\widehat{d}_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^{\Delta})}{d_{GH}(\mathbb{Z}_p,\ \mathbb{Z}_q^{\Delta})} = \frac{1+\frac{1}{q}}{\frac{1}{2q}} = 2q+2. \quad \square$$

References

[**BBI**] D. Burago, Y. Burago, S. Ivanov, A Course in Metric Geometry, Providence, Rhode Island: American Mathematical Society, 2001.

[**BGR**] S. Bosch, U. Guntzer, R. Remmert, Non-Archimedean Analysis, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1984.

[**G**] M. Gromov, Metric Structures for Riemannian and Non-Riemannian Spaces, Boston: Birkhauser, 2001.

[**K**] N. Koblitz, $p-$adic Numbers, $p-$adic Analysis, and Zeta Functions, Second Edition, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1984.

[**L**] S. Lang, Algebraic Number Theory, Second Edition, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1994.

[**Q1**] D. R. Qiu, Arithmetic applications of Non-Archimedean Gromov-Hausdorff metric, preparation.

[**Q2**] D. R. Qiu, Metric structures on $p-$adic manifolds, preparation.

[**Sc**] W. H. Schikhof, Ultrametric Calculus, London: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

[**Se**] J.-P. Serre, Local Fields, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1979.

[**Z**] I. Zarichnyi, Gromov-Hausdorff ultrametric *arXiv: math* / 0511437v1, 17 Nov. 2005.